



3 1761 06380340 7

Distinctive Doctrines



Donated to
THE LIBRARIES of
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

In Memory of

The Reverend Hjörtur B. Leo
and
Byron J. Leo

Hall & B. Johnson



The
Distinctive Doctrines

of the
**Different Christian Confessions,
in the Light of the
Word of God** ✠ ✠

Also a
**Presentation of the Significance and Harmony of
Evangelical Doctrine and a Summary of
the Principal Unsound Religious
Tendencies in Christianity.**

By
Dr. Karl Graul

Edited by Dr. Reinhold Seeberg, Professor of Theology
in Erlangen.

Translated from the Twelfth German Edition by
D. M. Martens, D. D.



Lutheran Book Concern
Columbus, Ohio

*"But strong meat belongeth to them that are
of full age, even those who, by reason of use,
have their senses exercised to discern both good
and evil."* HEB. 5, 14.



Preface.



IN 1862 the undersigned gave the Church the first English translation of *Graul's Distinctive Doctrines*. That was a translation of the *Fifth German Edition*, and in it, as stated in the Preface, "Luther's Confession of Faith and the Appendix" were omitted.

Under the skillful hand of Dr. Seeberg the latest, the twelfth, German edition has been much enlarged and improved, and we here give the English-reading portion of our Church the benefit of the entire work.

References to the Book of Concord are always, as will be seen, to the page in Jacobs' edition; but in a few instances the translation differs slightly from that of Jacobs.

The thanks of the undersigned—and of all who use this book—are due to the committee of the Publication Board who revised the manuscript before it was placed in the printer's hands. Their work enhances the value of the book.

The many words of encouragement the undersigned has received from men occupying positions of influence in the Church—in the East and the West—to furnish a new translation of this treatise, justify the hope that its appearance will be generally welcomed.

May the blessing of God rest on this book and on those who read it!

D. M. MARTENS.

Columbus, Ohio, March, 1897.

Table of Contents.



first Part.

OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE IN GENERAL, AND OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN DOC- TRINE IN PARTICULAR.

CHAPTER I. Concerning the Use of the Pure Doc- trine, and Concerning the Confession of Faith..	11
CHAPTER II. Luther's Confession of Faith.....	32
CHAPTER III. The Harmony of Evangelical Doctrine.	45

Second Part.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE DIFFERENT CHRISTIAN CONFESSIONS.

CHAPTER I. Distinctive Doctrines of the Romish Church	65
1, In the Article concerning the Word of God, 65; 2, Concerning God, 69; 3, Concerning Man, 85; 4, Concerning the Work of Christ, 88; 5, Con- cerning Faith, 89; 6, Concerning Justification, 89; 7, Concerning Grace, 92; 8, Concerning Repent- ance, 96; 9, Concerning the Sacrament, 99; 10, Concerning the Last Things, 107; 11, Concerning the Church (Clergy and Laity, the Pope, the Dogma of Infallibility), 108. — General Character of the Roman Catholic Church, 116. — <i>Appendix</i> : The Vatican Council and the Old-Catholic Movement, 118.	

CHAPTER II. Distinctive Doctrines of the Greek Church	122
Character of the Greek Church in General, 122; Like the Romish Church in regard to <i>Tradition, Scripture Interpretation, Invocation of Saints and Angels, Free Will, Grace, Transubstantiation, Degrees in Priesthood, Intermediate State</i> , 124.	
Differs from the Romish Church in the Article: 1, Concerning God, 127; 2, Baptism, 127; 3, Lord's Supper, 127; 4, The Church, 128.	
Parties and Sects in the Greek Church.....	128
Nestorians, Monophysites, Maronites, United Greeks, 129; the Raskól (different Sects) 129.	
CHAPTER III. Reformed Distinctive Doctrines.....	138
1, The Article Concerning God, 138; 2, Concerning the Person of Christ, 142; 3, Concerning Grace, 148; 4, Concerning the Work of Christ, 154; 5, Concerning Baptism, 154; 6, Concerning the Lord's Supper, 155; 7, Concerning the Office of the Keys, 163; 8, Concerning the Church, 165. — Concluding Remark, 165. Appendix I: The Church of England, 169. Appendix II: Concerning the Union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, 173; Concerning Election, 180; Concerning the Word, 186; Baptism, 193; the Lord's Supper, 197; the Person of Christ, 201; Luther on Gal. 5, 9, 205.	
CHAPTER IV. Distinctive Doctrines of the Arminians	209
CHAPTER V. Distinctive Doctrines of the Socinians.	211
CHAPTER VI. Distinctive Doctrines of the Menonites	216
CHAPTER VII. Distinctive Doctrines of the Baptists and Neobaptists.....	220
CHAPTER VIII. Distinctive Doctrines of the Quakers	223

CHAPTER IX. Distinctive Doctrines of the Swedenborgians	225
CHAPTER X. Distinctive Doctrines of the Irvingites	228
CHAPTER XI. Distinctive Doctrines of the Mormons The Shakers, 236; Spiritualists, 237.	233
CHAPTER XII. Society for the Gathering of the People of God in Jerusalem.....	240
Jewish-Christian Movement in Kischenew, 244.	
CHAPTER XIII. Distinctive Doctrines of the Moravians	247
CHAPTER XIV. Distinguishing Peculiarities of the Methodists	253
Albright Brethren, 256; Otterbeinians, 256; Pearsall Smith, 256; the Salvation Army, 262.	

Third Part.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL UNSOUND RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES IN CHRISTIANITY.

Retrospect, 269; The Lukewarm and Undecided Tendency, 272; The Catholicizing Tendency, 273; The Tendency to Dead Orthodoxy, 275; The Pietistic Tendency, 275; The Moravianizing Tendency, 277; The Mystic Tendency, 280; Concluding Remark, 282.

first Part.



Of Christian Doctrine in General, and of the
Evangelical Lutheran Doctrine
in Particular.

Chapter I.

CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PURE DOCTRINE, AND CONCERNING THE CONFES- SION OF FAITH.

WE live, dear reader, in trying, portentous times. The Evangelical (Lutheran) Church has occasion to learn, by experience, that our Lord did not come to send peace on the earth, but a sword (Matt. 10, 34). She is opposed and sorely tried by unbelief, by indifference, by practical materialism; enemies that always find adherents among the masses of our people. The Roman Catholic Church to-day opposes the Evangelical Church with greater might and better equipped for the fray than ever. The Evangelical (Lutheran) Church is made little of and antagonized by the sects who, if possible, would represent her as unable to break to the people the bread of life. Thus the cry of battle and the clash of arms are again heard without the gate of the citadel.

But, is harmony to be found, at least within the citadel itself? This, alas, we cannot claim. What a number of half-way — or even less than that — believers there are within our own camp, who declare that with full consciousness they confess the Gospel! There are those among us who are for the Gospel, simply because they regard it as a means for restrain-

ing the masses of the people, expecting help from the Church in the many social troubles of the present time; then again we meet others who, it is true, accept the Gospel in part but, with a shake of the head, reject a great deal more as being antiquated doctrine, not adapted to our times; then we hear of others who are quite willing to enjoy the fruits that mature on the Gospel-tree but dread to let the keen plowshare of repentance, without whose work the Gospel-tree cannot take root within us, enter the field of their hearts.

At such a time, dear reader, it is necessary to assure ourselves of the inheritance we have received from our fathers in the faith. This inheritance must again and again be laid hold of within us, that it may not vanish from our hearts. This inheritance is the faith of our Church, the faith of Luther. The question here is not about any mere views or opinions, which at best are only a helpful supplement for this life, but of that precious boon that makes man free, glad and happy, as our Luther was. Our inheritance not only contains doctrines but offers the treasures of faith to every one who will enter into the spirit of the faith of our fathers. O that this faith might be kindled anew in the hearts of our people, how it would sing and purl, like the gentle breezes of spring, in our homes and in our public affairs, as it did at that time after the Wars of Deliverance, when also heart after heart learned to pray and began to confess: "The Lord hath done this!"

But, it does not seem as if the Lord would grant such seasons of refreshing to His Church at once.

Many a heart in our midst grows weary, and many an ear regards it as a strikingly true assertion when it is emphatically declared that the trouble lies just in this, that so much stress is laid on confession and doctrine. We are told that faith has a double meaning. "Faith," on the one hand may be the doctrine which is believed; "faith," on the other hand is what the heart does in that we put our confidence in God. So then, we are told, not the confession saves us, *i. e.* certain doctrines do not do this, but that which takes place within our hearts. After all, but little depends on the pure doctrine; it even repels many an honest soul.

What is thus said seems to be all right. Certainly we are not saved by accepting the articles of faith as true, or because we have proper conceptions of God, of Christ, of justification, of the judgment, etc. One having the pure doctrine may go to hell, another, having only the poor confession of the malefactor, be saved! The main point however is, not to have the proper conception of these things, but to have the things themselves. All depends on this, that the living God has become *my* God, that Christ my Savior has taken up His abode in my heart, that I myself have attained to, and experienced the grace of the forgiveness of my sins, that justification be enclosed in the faith of the heart, just as a pearl is set in a golden ring, and that my heart, in the consciousness of final accountability, have become accustomed to the atmosphere of eternity.

That it is so, is beyond all doubt. Just as no other one can believe for me, so within myself my intellect must not arrogate to itself that which is a matter of the heart, the inner sanctuary. It depends, not on the comprehension, but on the apprehension. What God the Lord graciously permitted me to attain to and experience this constitutes faith.

Very well! Is it then not true as has been said, that very little depends on plain, pure doctrine, that everything depends on the heart alone? Göthe says: "Feeling is everything! A *name* is mere sound and vapor, and like the vapors that dim the glow of heaven."

Pause a little, my friend! Is it indeed so that our conception of anything has nothing to do with our possessing it? Is it really a matter of indifference by what "name" we designate anything? Life does not confirm this. How many a one has met us in a friendly manner, both in word and deed. But we had an antipathy to him, others had prejudiced us against him. So we turned him away, misconstruing his words and actions. The man's intentions toward us were none the less good, but we deprived ourselves of the benefit and blessing of them. Why? Because we had a false conception of him, because we did not know how to give his character the right "name." It is precisely so when the personal God moves our hearts by His grace. Surely, it is not a matter of indifference how this matter has been presented to you. Whether you, by your own good deeds presume to merit grace, or whether you will let Him work, for

He, He alone can do it. It is not a matter of indifference whether, at the Lord's table, where the Lord Jesus Himself comes to you, you think: Here is an emblem, here my soul must climb to heaven on the ladder of this emblem; or whether you know: He is here, I will sit still, like Mary did; I need not climb up to Him; He has come down to me. Of course, God's gift of grace is the same, no matter what or how I think of it. But whether I can receive the full gift with all its blessing, that is the question. I must know where the gift is and how it comes, else, instead of reaching out with the hand of my heart towards it I will grope around at random and lose it.

To sum up: It is not all the same what doctrine or view we accept, or what "name" we give a thing, but in view of the blessing we may receive from it, it is very important. If some one should arrive at the foolish idea that the light of the sun is injurious, and anxiously shade his windows, the light would still dispense its blessings, but the person in question would deprive himself of a good share of that blessing. That this is really so we see best from this, that God did not leave it to men to form a conception of Him from their own heart's experience, but revealed Himself, *i. e.* caused it to be told to men in words, who He is, what He does, and what He wills.

Therefore let us hold fast to the pure Evangelical doctrine, for it teaches us so to know God, Christ, sin and grace, as they really are. It gives to objects the right names, so that we may know how to lay

hold of and keep them, when they really present themselves to us.

But, at this point I hear the objection raised, To what end do we need special confessional writings? God's revelation is given us in the Bible, is not this all-sufficient? We know that the Catholics do not admit this, but place tradition at the side of the Scriptures, and require an acceptance of that also. We have nothing in common with this answer. Certainly the Scriptures present to us divine revelation in a sufficiently clear manner, so as to meet all our demands. But "understandest thou what thou readest?" (Acts 8, 30). The Bible is made up of a number of different books, written in different languages, at widely different times, under very different circumstances, each with a special object in view. Hence it is very easy to misunderstand the Bible, or to interpret it according to our favorite, preconceived notions. When Paul wrote to the Corinthians that it is better not to marry than to marry (1 Cor. 7, 1. 38), he knew very well why he needed to urge this at that time, namely because it "is good for the present distress" (v. 26). Later the words were made to mean that those who remain celibates thereby acquire special merit. And when St. James wrote some "hard" words about faith without works (James 2, 14-26), it was because those for whom he wrote needed them. But he, knowing as he did the passage which underlies the doctrine of justification by faith (v. 23), certainly had no idea that any one would presume to use his words to distort, nay to set aside, that fundamental doctrine of the Old

and New Testament. Those holding the ancient faith (Starowérzy) in Russia went so far as to maintain that the passage Matthew 15, 18. (those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man) prohibits smoking. These are only a few examples, but the history of the Church abundantly proves that the sects especially have tried to prove the strangest and most absurd doctrines by the Holy Scriptures.

Hence the Church, from the very beginning, has taught her members what the truth of the Gospel is, how one may arrive at an understanding of the Scripture. For this purpose, in the very earliest times already, they used the baptismal confession or rule of faith, which, as the "Apostolic Creed," is used among us also as a guide for instructing our youth in the fundamental truths of faith. Then, when errors crept into the Church, ampler confessions became necessary as a barrier against the encroachment of heresies.

But, if you ask: Of what use are such confessions, have we not ministers and teachers for the very purpose of leading our congregations into the right understanding of the Scriptures? — I answer: Are you really willing to submit unquestioningly to the wavering view, or the perhaps perverse or immature opinion of any teacher or minister? Is it not rather good and salutary that these men themselves have had the confessions as a guide to the proper understanding of the truth of Scripture, and that they were bound by a solemn vow to teach their congregations in the spirit of Luther?

Our congregations are to be instructed in the spirit of our Confessions, which, during the work of the Reformation, proved itself to be a holy spirit. The confessional writings, to which their ministers were required to subscribe, even now serve to retain for our congregations the pure Christian doctrine. But the position we assign to the Evangelical Confessions must not be confounded with that which is assigned to tradition by the Romanists. The Evangelical Christian regards the teachings of the Confessions as true, and demands that the servant of the Church adhere to them, not because the Church has given the Confessions, *i. e.* not because he reposes his trust in the Church, but because they agree with the revealed word of God. The Holy Scriptures alone are, of right, the final court of appeal. And the Confessions themselves always refer, back of and beyond themselves, to the Scriptures. Thus too the congregations should be led on themselves to make use of this precious prerogative of Christians, namely, like those noble Christians in Berea, to "search the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17, 11).

Would we not all do well to acquaint ourselves more thoroughly with these Confessions, which, like our Augsburg Confession or Luther's Large Catechism, tell us so beautifully what the true import of the Lutheran faith is? He whose heart is grounded in the Lutheran faith, he who lives in the grace of God, will readily see that the Confessions are not burdensome, strange, doctrinal laws which one cannot understand and to which one must therefore unwill-

lingly submit. He will see that here just that is set forth clearly and definitely which he himself has been in possession of long ago, and from which his heart has derived nourishment and comfort in good and evil days. Our Confessions are to be looked upon, not as a police-ordinance enacted for imprisoned criminals, but as rules for God's children in the house of their Father. These household rules are intended to direct them to feel themselves at home in the Father's house, and to make use of all the treasures and privileges which it offers them, at the right time, and in the right way, for their own salvation. Thus then we will seek to conform ourselves to those household rules and love them more fervently, so that both we and those belonging to us may feel more and more at home in the house of the Church, until we pass from faith here below where it is constantly hindered and dimmed by the devil, the world and the flesh, to the blessedness of sight in our Father's kingdom. O happy those among us who will then be able to say: "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me" (Isa. 8, 18)!

But the time has not come yet of which the Lord says: "And there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd" (John 10, 16); the different Confessions, parties and sects into which Christendom is divided are still estranged from, nay often inimical to each other. This is calculated to fill the Christian's heart with deep sorrow. Nay, it may even happen that, when we note so many advantages in other communions or meet exceptionally noble representatives of other creeds,

we begin to grow doubtful about our own Confession or at least regard the boundary lines which separate the pious from each other with a shake of the head. Should we not, so we are asked, remove these lines now when the world with its unbelief and hatred storms so mightily against the kingdom of Christ? Should we not at such times cling together harmoniously and wage a common warfare against the so powerful enemy? Many say this, and act accordingly. That we all who faithfully fight under the banner of Christ constitute one army cannot be called in question. But would we then be true soldiers of Christ, if we should seek to bring confusion into the line of battle and arbitrarily forsake our own division? No, our duty is to stand firm there where not chance but God has placed us, there where He is according to the experience of our heart.

But we will not allow our eyes to be dimmed by sudden ebullitions of feeling. Much rather will we bear in mind that the various Confessions have been formed not by chance or without cause. There were real differences which, despite all efforts, could not be removed. And upon close examination we will find that these differences exist to-day yet. And those who are conscientious and sincere in their faith are the very ones in whom these differences are most clearly manifest. Those who are not earnestly concerned about their own creed will at last make terms with any one. But, shall we allow such persons to decide for us in matters of this kind? This would be a strange demand! If you will compare a pious Cath-

olic with a pious Protestant, or even a true member of the Reformed Church with a true Lutheran, you will not fail immediately to see the great and sharply defined differences. If this cannot be denied in the case of individuals, then the same will still hold good, that the congregations also should have a clear understanding of the differences between their own and other Confessions. To strengthen this consciousness is the purpose this little book would serve.

In doing this it shall be far from us to even wish to disparage the individual members of other churches. Far from us be also the thought that salvation can be found only in our church! How many true, estimable Christians have we found in other denominations! But, one thing we must of course maintain, viz. that if we regard our doctrine of Christ, of the means of grace and of the work of redemption as true, then those teaching otherwise are in error. We have already seen that these errors are not insignificant, that they may lead up to grave misunderstandings with reference to grace. But we know too that they in their effects may be so restrained by the grace of God, that the person holding them may still reach the goal. The Catholic Church lays much stress upon works performed by the individual; but how many a pious soul in that church—especially in the last extremity—looks to grace alone.

The Confessions are related to each other like different roads leading to the same place. But here is one road which is most sure to lead to that place, walking on which one never loses sight of the goal

because it is a straight road. Then there are other roads, leading through many by-ways, deep ravines and over high mountains, and where one must make his way through a dense growth of underbrush. How many a one, under these conditions, may go astray until it is too late and the shades of evening begin to darken; how many a one may grow weak and weary, because he has so soon lost sight of the goal, and quit the race! Now, if you have learned to know the right way dare you thoughtlessly venture to follow one of the by-ways, in the hope that it may finally lead to the goal? No, let us thank God that He has placed our feet on the right way, and let us not depart from it either to the right or to the left!

But is it not a mark of vanity to say that we have the truth and others are in error? This objection would be justified only then if we should claim to have invented or discovered the truth ourselves. But we confess that only the grace of God has given it to us, and that we hold it to be the truth only because it agrees with God's revealed word. And then, where can you find a real conviction that does not necessarily accuse all those thinking otherwise of error? Or does any one propose to frighten us by the threadbare charge of unfashionable, antiquated intolerance? Only those can be accused of intolerance who will not tolerate others at all, who deny them the right of existence, and want to force them to think as they themselves do. But the Lutheran Church knows that she is not guilty of such conduct. She believes that she has the truth, but respects the right of free con-

viction on all sides. Of course, that miserable twaddle of modern semi-culture that raves about all manner of possible convictions by reason of which it claims to have the right to oppose the Church and the Bible, of that semi-culture which knows as good as nothing of any and all things, but simply repeats what it hears others say—that we cannot regard and honor as personal conviction. It shall not disturb us at all if from that quarter they continue to reproach us with intolerance. Or, what should we care for the talk of those who cannot distinguish between religious conviction and intolerance? All this, however, is not to be regarded as a reflection on other churches that stand opposed to us.

What we want to say is this, that it is our privilege and our duty to hold fast to the doctrines of our Lutheran Church.

But what means have we to ascertain the differences between other Confessions and our own Church? The title of our little book gives the answer to this question: the "*Distinctive Doctrines.*" Of course the various denominations differ also as to forms of worship and morals. But since the usages and customs of different countries, as well as the sin and weakness of the individual, have much to do with such differences, these cannot help us as a standard to judge by. Thus then we must turn to the doctrine. This will soon show us what view the church in question holds concerning God and Christ, concerning sin and grace, concerning faith and works, and in general concerning Christian life. This is just what we want to know.

And even if not all the individuals in a certain church are guided by the principles of their Confession, these principles still show us what they are striving after in this church, what they regard as the central and main thing in Christianity.

Thus then we propose to become acquainted not only with the doctrines of our Church, but also with those of other churches, for the express purpose of learning to know the greater excellence of our own. We learn to know the doctrine of others from their *confessional writings*. With the several Confessions as the source, we present the distinctive doctrines of the various Christian Confessions, in what follows. But we dare not be content with simply showing wherein they differ from our Lutheran faith, but shall also have to show that herein they at the same time differ and depart from the Holy Scriptures. For this is the supreme principle among us, when the question as to what is true or false in Christian doctrine is raised, that only that is true which *agrees with the Holy Scriptures*; in other words, that only that is pure *Christian doctrine* which agrees with *original Christian doctrine*.

And now, dear reader, since we have seen of what great value our own Confession is, and have also come to an understanding as to our purpose in what follows, let me just show you yet in a few words how Confessions originated in the Church and which are the most important.

For three centuries the Church was content with the simple Baptismal Confession. The Church found

it sufficient simply to emphasize the facts in the history of the work of redemption, both over against her heathen opponents and the half-heathen Gnostics. But when, in the beginning of the fourth century, *Arius* appeared, maintaining that Christ is only a creature, the workmanship of God, as we all are, a being however of a higher order than men or angels, a kind of demi-god as it were, the Council of Nice assembled (325) and, under the leadership of Athanasius, set up this declaration against Arius, that Christ is "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father." Since the Council of Constantinople (381) a Confession closely related to this, but presenting more elaborately the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, has been circulated and recognized. This is the *Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed*, which is also sometimes used in our church service, viz. under the name "Nicene."

But the Church had to engage in still further conflicts with reference to the doctrine of the person of our Lord. Now that His Divinity was established, closer inquiry was made as to the relation of the human to the divine nature in Christ. Some maintained that the relation of the two natures to each other was that of two boards joined together; a loose, external relation. Thus *Nestorius* and his adherents. Others thought that we should really speak of only *one* nature. If the first assumption gave rise to the fear that the Divinity of Christ had no part whatever in His sufferings and death, and that therefore these have no redeeming efficacy, so the other led to the doubt, which

could not be ignored, whether the human nature was not so absorbed by the divine nature of Christ as to lose its self-existence (*Monophysites*). If the first relation presents to us the picture of two boards joined together, the second leads us to think of a drop of wine lost in a bucket of water. For the consideration of this matter the Synod of Ephesus (431) and that of Chalcedon (451) were held. The result of these *controversies* was the *definition* that after the incarnation of Christ the one person subsists *in* two natures, both of which are comprehended in the unity of the person, and that this union is without any confusion, change, division, or separation of the two natures.

These are the ecclesiastical tenets or dogmas which the ancient Church of the Orient brought forth. Christ, true God and true man, is the result of the labor of this — *i. e.* the Greek — portion, of the ancient Church.

The Latin Occident took an active part in this labor and itself suggested further questions with reference to Christian knowledge, and at the same time offered their solution. When Pelagius expressed the view that there is no original sin, that all men are born as sinless as Adam was created, that they are led to sin only by the teaching and example which they hear and see, and that accordingly the teachings and example of Christ suffice to save men, the mighty bishop of Hippo, Augustine, appeared in opposition to him. Augustine's own life and conduct had taught him that we as children of Adam are all by nature sinners, in a lost condition. Only grace and that alone can save

us; grace makes us new creatures. But that not even the least part of redemption might be ascribed to what man does, Augustine promulgated the doctrine of absolute predestination. God determined beforehand that certain ones should be saved, the others left to destruction. In the case of the former grace works in an irresistible manner, and they cannot be lost; in the case of the latter the operation of God's word on them is such only in appearance; they cannot be saved. After many conflicts Augustine's doctrine of sin and grace received churchly sanction at the Synod of Orange (529).—In opposition to the Donatists, a fanatical sect claiming that the Church must be absolutely pure, Augustine referred to this, that in the Church there must necessarily be chaff along with the wheat; but as for the rest he also adopted the view, predominant in his day already, that the bishops are the Church, and that to belong to the Church means to yield obedience to the bishops.

Besides these doctrines, to which much importance was attached, and which consequently gave rise to severe conflicts, the ancient Church naturally had her views with reference to the other component parts of Christian doctrine. If we look at her conception of the Christian religion, we can only say in general that she departed widely from the pure, clear knowledge of the Gospel as found in the New Testament Scriptures. But just at the point where the opponents tried to corrupt the Gospel with specifically unchristian errors, she succeeded in bringing to light and estab-

lishing views of lasting worth. Of these we have just been speaking.

The middle ages did not further the knowledge of Christian truth. In the Orient they clung to their interest in the cultus, which had gradually come to the front and supplanted the interest in matters of doctrine. The history of the iconoclastic controversy, ending with the Council of Nice, 787, furnishes a very suggestive picture of this one-sidedness. In the Catholic Occident they held fast, during the middle ages, to the doctrine they had received. But the evils and defects of ecclesiastical affairs naturally cast their darkening shadow also upon matters of doctrine. Men laid stress upon the unlimited authority of the priesthood, with the vicar of Christ, the pope, at the head; upon the external view of the sacraments, which infuse new powers into the souls of men; upon the doctrine that man has been only wounded by sin, but that after he has received the powers of grace he can do good works and thus acquire merit which will avail before God; and upon indulgences, the adoration of saints, Mary, etc.

For a while it seemed, too, as though the Church could find rest and peace under that false conception of Christianity. But in the fifteenth century, at the close of the middle ages, men's hearts experienced great anguish. All the means which the Church recommended were applied in feverish assiduity. Still the desired end (peace of conscience) was not attained. There appeared many who severely condemned the notorious errors of the Church in doctrine and life

(*e. g.* Wickliffe, Huss, Wesel, Wessel), but no one succeeded in presenting anything new and approved in their place. Then God raised up Martin Luther. In the burning anguish of his heart he learned to know the Gospel. And what he experienced in his heart he found confirmed by the Holy Scriptures. And now his conscience impelled him to arise and rend the fetters in which the hierarchy had bound the people. Luther did not invent a new, but *renewed* the old apostolic conception of Christianity. In doing this he retained all the good, true doctrines that the old Church had established, at the same time more firmly establishing and enriching them. This is true as well of the conception of the person of Christ as of the doctrines of sin and grace. What Luther did in Germany, was accomplished—true, as we shall soon see, partly from another point of view and in another manner—by Zwingli and Calvin in Switzerland. The Gospel found favor in still wider and widening circles. Soon two other Confessions stood opposed to the old Roman Catholic Church.

What they objected to in the Romish Church, why they had to separate from her and again what they themselves taught—this was expressed in their respective Confessions. Later on, when the antitheses between the German and Swiss Reformation became more clearly defined, when in their own ranks divergent views as to important doctrines became apparent, the two new churches (*i. e.* Lutheran and Reformed) were compelled to defend their position also over against each other. Notwithstanding the now clearer

and better knowledge of the Gospel, the Romish Church held fast to her doctrine and so expressed herself at the Council of Trent.

The Lutheran Confessional Writings are: the Large Catechism and the Small Catechism (1529) of Luther, the Augsburg Confession (1530), the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (1530), the two latter written by Melancthon, the Smalcald Articles, written by Luther (1537), and the Formula of Concord (1580).

The Reformed Confessional Writings will not all be mentioned here. We refer only to the most important: the Heidelberg Catechism (1562), the second Helvetic Confession (1566), the Westminster Confession of Faith (1648), finally, by way of settlement of the controversies about the doctrine of predestination, the Canons of the Synod of Dordrecht (1619).

The Confessional Writings of the Roman Catholics are: the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), the Confessions of the Tridentine Faith (1564), the Romish Catechism (1566), and finally the Decrees and Canons of the Vatican Council (1870).

Of the Confessions of the Greek Catholic Church we mention the Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith of the Oriental Church (by Peter Mogilas, 1643), the Confession of Dositheus (1672), and finally the Catechism of Philaret (1839), approved by the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg.

IF in the following we attempt to characterize the Evangelical Lutheran conception of Christianity in its

fundamentals, it is eminently proper to begin with Luther's confession of faith. In 1528, hence prior to the origin of the Augsburg Confession, Luther, in his "Large Confession concerning the Lord's Supper," directed against the Zwinglian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, published in full outline a final Confession of Faith which embraces every single point of Doctrine. We give this Confession in the following chapter.



Chapter II.

LUTHER'S CONFESSION OF FAITH.

(OF THE YEAR 1528.)

SINCE I see that schism and error are growing worse and worse, and that there is no end to the raving and storming of Satan—in order that no one may hereafter, either during my life or after my death, appeal to me and distort my writings to confirm his error (as the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists began to do)—I will here in detail and in writing confess before God and all the world the faith which I propose to hold until death, and in which (so help me God) I propose to depart from this world and to appear before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ. And if any one, after my death, should say: If Luther were living yet he would hold and teach this or that article otherwise, for he did not weigh it sufficiently, etc.; against such I say now as then, and then as now, that by the grace of God I have most diligently considered these articles, have compared them with the Scriptures again and again, and would as surely defend them as I have already defended the Sacrament of the Altar. I am now neither drunken nor inconsiderate, I know what I am saying and also well realize my accountability at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ to judgment. Therefore

let no one esteem this as a jest or mere idle talk, for to me it is a very serious matter indeed. For by God's grace I know Satan thoroughly. If he can pervert and misconstrue the Word of God, what may he not do with my words or those of another?

In the first place I believe with my whole heart the exalted article concerning the *Divine Majesty*, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three distinct persons, are indeed one, natural, true God, Creator of heaven, earth and all things, and this I believe against the Arians, Macedonians, Sabellians and such like heretics, Gen. 1, 1; as this has hitherto been held both by the Romish Church and by all Christian churches throughout the world.

In the second place, I believe and know that the Scriptures teach us that the second person in the Godhead, namely the *Son*, alone became *true man*, being conceived of the Holy Ghost without the intervention of man, and born of the pure, holy virgin Mary, as of a true natural mother as St. Luke clearly describes all this chapter 1, 26, and the prophets have also foretold it; so that neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost became man as some heretics have taught. Also that God the Son assumed not only the body without the soul (as some heretics have taught), but also the soul, that is the complete humanity, and was born as the true seed or child promised to Abraham and David and the natural son of Mary, in every way and form a true man, as I myself and all others are (Heb. 7, 26); except that He was without sin and came into this world of the virgin alone through the Holy Ghost.

And that such man is true God, uniting God and man in one eternal, indivisible person; so that Mary, the holy virgin, is the real, true mother, not only of the man Christ, as the Nestorians teach, but of the Son of God, as St. Luke says chapter 1, 35: "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," that is, my and all men's Lord, Jesus Christ, God's and Mary's only, true, natural Son, true God and man.

I also believe that such Son of God and Mary, our Lord Jesus Christ, has suffered, was crucified, dead and buried for us poor sinners, whereby *through His innocent blood* He has redeemed us from sin, death and the eternal wrath of God, and that He arose again from the dead on the third day, and ascended to heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Almighty Father, Lord over all lords, King over all kings, and over all creatures in heaven, earth and under the earth, over death and life, over sin and righteousness.

For I confess and know how to prove from the Scriptures that all men are descended from one man, Adam, and by their birth received and inherited from him the fall, guilt and sin, of which the same Adam, by the malice of the devil, was guilty in Paradise, and thus together with him are all *born in sin*, live and die in sin, and must be given over to eternal death, had not Jesus Christ come to our help, taken upon Himself as an innocent Lamb our guilt and sin, and paid for us with His sufferings; still daily interceding for

us as a faithful, merciful Mediator, Savior and the only High Priest and Bishop of our souls.

Herewith I reject and condemn, as erroneous throughout, every doctrine which magnifies our free will, as being in direct opposition to such help and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. For since outside of Christ death and sin are our lords, and the devil our god and prince, there can be no power nor might, no wit nor understanding, by which we could fit ourselves for, or strive after, righteousness and life; but, blinded and captive, slaves of sin and Satan, must do and think what pleases them and is contrary to God's will and commands.

I also condemn both the new and the old Pelagians, who will not admit that original sin is sin, but claim that it is a frailty or defect. But since death has passed upon all men, original sin must be not only a frailty but a very great sin, as St. Paul says: "The wages of sin is death," Rom. 6, 27. And again: "The sting of death is sin," 1 Cor. 15, 56. So too David says Psalm 51, 5: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." He does not say: My mother conceived me with sin, but I, *I* was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me; that is, in my mother's womb I was formed of sinful seed, a rendering of which the Hebrew text admits.

Accordingly I reject and condemn also as being nothing but the devil's crew and error all monastic orders, rules, cloisters, foundations, and whatever has been invented and established by men over and beyond the Scriptures, and was upheld with vows and self-

imposed duties; although many great saints have lived in them, and, though being the elect of God, were yet for the time being deceived by them, yet at last were delivered through faith in Jesus Christ. For since men live in such orders, foundations and sects, thinking that by such ways and works they will and can be saved, escape sin and death, it is an open, dreadful blasphemy and denial of the only help and grace of our only Savior and Mediator Jesus Christ; for there is no other name given unto us by which we may be saved, except this, which is called Jesus Christ, Acts 4, 12; and it is impossible that there should be more Saviors, ways or means of being saved, than through the only righteousness, which our Savior Jesus Christ is and has, given to us and presented to God as our only propitiation (or mercy-seat), Rom. 3, 25.

It would be a fine thing to have cloisters and foundations for the purpose of teaching young men God's Word, the Scriptures and Christian discipline, thus training and fitting well skilled men for bishops, pastors and other servants of the Church, also thoroughly educated men for temporal government, and fine, modest, educated women to preside over Christian households and train up children. But to make of them a means of salvation is a doctrine and belief of devils, 1 Tim. 4.

The only holy orders and institutions established of God are these three: The ministerial office, matrimony, temporal government. All who are in the pastoral office or in the service of the Word, are in a holy, legitimate, good order and station, one well-

pleasing to God, those namely who preach, administer the sacraments, have charge of the common treasury, sextons and messengers or servants who minister unto them, etc. These are indeed holy works before God. So then to be father or mother, to govern the house well and to train up children for the service of God, is also really a holy state, a holy work and holy order. So too when children or servants are obedient to their parents or masters, this is nothing but holiness, and whoever is found in this state, is a living saint on earth. So too a prince or sovereign, judges, officials, chancellors, clerks, man-servants, maid-servants, and all who serve them and all subjects, all this is nothing but a holy work and holy life before God, because these three institutions or orders are comprehended in God's Word and command. But whatever is comprehended in God's Word must be holy. For the Word of God is holy, and sanctifies everything that comes in contact with it.

Above and greater than these three institutions and orders is the general order of Christian love, in which we serve, not only these three orders, but in general every one who is in need with all kinds of benefits, in that we give food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, etc., forgive our enemies, pray for all men on earth, suffer all manner of evils in the world, etc. See now, all these are really good, holy works. Still no such order is a means for our salvation, but aside from all these there remains this one and only way, namely faith in Jesus Christ. For there is a vast difference between being holy and being saved. Saved we are

alone through Christ, but holy we become both through such faith and also through such divine institutions and orders. Even ungodly persons may have about them much that is holy, but they are not on this account in a saved condition; for God wants us to do such works to His praise and honor, and all those who are saved by their faith in Christ do such works and observe such orders. What has been said of matrimony holds good also with reference to widowhood and the state of virginity; for they belong to the family and the household arrangements. Now if these orders and institutions do not save us, what can the devil's institutions and cloisters do, which have sprung up without God's Word and, what is more, strive and rave against the one and only way of faith.

In the third place, I believe in the *Holy Ghost*, who, with the Father and the Son, is one true God, and from eternity proceeds from the Father and the Son, and still in the one divine essence and nature is a distinct person. Through Him as a living, eternal, divine gift, all believers are adorned with faith and other spiritual gifts, raised from the dead, delivered from their sins, and are made joyful and glad, free and secure in their consciences. For this is our boast, when we feel the witness of the Spirit in our hearts, that God is our Father, forgives our sins, and will bestow upon us eternal life.

These are the three persons and one God who has given Himself freely to all of us with all that He is and has. The Father gives Himself to us with heaven and earth, together with all creatures, that they may

serve us and be useful to us. But this gift was obscured and rendered useless by the fall of Adam. Therefore the Son afterward gave Himself also to us, all His works, suffering, wisdom and righteousness, and reconciled us with the Father, in order that we might again live and be justified and also know the Father and have Him and His gifts. But since such grace would be of no use to any one, if it should remain concealed, and could not come to us, the Holy Spirit also comes and gives Himself to us unreservedly; He teaches us to recognize and know such benefaction of Christ shown us, helps us receive and keep it, make good use of it, spread it abroad, increase and promote it. And this He does both within and without us; within us through faith and other spiritual gifts, without us through the Gospel, through Baptism and the Sacrament of the Altar, through which as through three means or ways He comes to us and applies to us the suffering of Christ that it may serve for our salvation.

Therefore I maintain and know, that just as there is not more than one Gospel and one Christ, so also there is not more than *one Baptism*. And that Baptism in itself is a divine ordinance, as is also His Gospel. And just as the Gospel is not therefore false or wrong because some use or teach it falsely or do not believe it, so too Baptism is not false or wrong although some receive or administer it without faith or otherwise abuse it. Wherefore I reject and condemn altogether the doctrine of the Anabaptists and Donatists and whoever they may be who rebaptize.

In like manner I speak of, and confess, *the Sacrament of the Altar*, that in it we orally eat and drink the body and blood in the bread and wine, although the priests who administer it or those who receive it should not believe or should otherwise abuse it. For this Sacrament is not based upon man's faith or lack of faith, but upon God's Word and institution. Unless indeed they should beforehand change and misinterpret the Word and ordinance of God, as the enemies of the Sacrament to-day do, who of course have only bread and wine; for they have not the Word and appointed ordinance of God, but have subverted and changed the same according to their own whim.

In the next place, I believe that there is *one Holy Christian Church*, which is the congregation and sum total or assembly of all Christians in the whole world, the only bride of Christ and His spiritual body, of which also He is the only Head; and the bishops or ministers are not her heads nor lords nor bridegrooms, but servants, friends and (as the word bishop indicates) overseers, curators or ministers. And this same Christendom is found not only in the Romish Church or under the pope, but in all the world; as the prophets have foretold, that the Gospel of Christ should come into all the world. Ps. 2, Ps. 19, 5. So that Christendom is dispersed under and among the pope, Turks, Persians, Tartars and everywhere bodily, but spiritually united in the one Gospel and faith, under one Head, which is Jesus Christ. For the papacy is certainly the true antichristian government or tyranny, which sits in the temple of God and rules with the

commandments of men, as Christ says Matthew 24, 24 and St. Paul 2 Thessalonians 2, 4. The Turk and all heresy, wherever found, also belong to the abomination of which it is foretold that it shall stand in the holy place, but they are not, like the papacy, the antichrist.

In this Christendom and wherever it is there is *forgiveness of sins*; that is, a kingdom of grace and of true absolution. For there we find the Gospel, Baptism, the Sacrament of the Altar, in which forgiveness of sin is sought and received, and there too is Christ and His Spirit, nay, God Himself. And outside of this Christian Church there is no salvation nor forgiveness of sins, but everlasting death and damnation; though there may be a great show of holiness and many good works, yet all is lost. Such forgiveness of sins, however, is not to be expected at once, in Baptism for instance (as the Novatians teach), but as often and as many times as we need it until death.

But the *indulgence* which the Papal Church has and gives is a blasphemous delusion; not only because it invents and sets up a special forgiveness at the side of the general forgiveness of the Gospel and Sacrament as bestowed throughout the Church, and thus dishonors and destroys the general forgiveness, but also because it places and bases the satisfaction for sins upon human works and the merit of saints, notwithstanding that Christ alone can render and has rendered satisfaction for us.

Since the Scriptures say nothing about it, I hold that it is no sin in the exercise of devotion to pray for *the dead* somewhat like this: Dear Lord, if the condi-

tion of the soul is such that help can be afforded, be Thou gracious to it, etc. And when this has been done once or twice, let it suffice; for the vigils and masses for souls, and yearly processions are useless and are the devil's fair.

Nor do we find anything in the Scriptures about *purgatory*; this, too, of course, is an invention of ghosts or sprites; therefore I hold that it is not necessary to believe in it, although with God all things are possible and He could also permit the soul to be tormented after it leaves the body. But He did not reveal anything about this; therefore He does not want us to believe it. But I know of another purgatory, of which, however, we are not to teach anything in the congregation, and against which nothing is to be accomplished by institutions or vigils.

As to *the invocation of saints*, others have opposed this before I did; and I am pleased to believe that Christ alone is to be called upon as our Mediator; the Scriptures teach this and it is sure. The Scriptures teach nothing about the invocation of saints, therefore it is uncertain and can not be relied on.

As to *anointing with oil*, if this were done according to the Gospel Mark 6, 13 and James 5, 14, I would let it pass; but to make a sacrament of it will not do. For just as instead of vigils and masses for the soul we might preach a sermon concerning death and eternal life, and thus, in connection with the burial of the dead, pray and meditate on our end (as the ancients seem to have done), so also it were well to visit the sick, pray with them and admonish them, and if any

one wishes besides this to anoint them with oil they should have liberty to do so in God's name.

Nor dare we make a sacrament of *matrimony* and the *office of the priesthood*; they are orders holy enough in themselves. And likewise *repentance* is nothing else than the use and power of Baptism; so that besides the Gospel there remains Baptism and the Supper of our Lord in which the Holy Ghost richly offers, gives and applies to us the forgiveness of sins.

As the chief of all abominations I regard *the mass* which is preached and sold as a sacrifice or good work, upon which, too, all foundations and cloisters now stand, but (if it please God) will soon have fallen to the ground. For, although I have been a great, great, grievous and shameful sinner, and spent and lost my youth in a most reprehensible manner, still these are my greatest sins, that I was such a holy monk, and for more than fifteen years so greatly offended, grieved and tormented my dear Lord with so many masses. But praise and thanks be to Him forever for His unspeakable grace, that He has led me out of this abomination and still daily preserves and strengthens me in the true faith (although ungrateful as I am).

Accordingly my advice has been and still is to leave the foundations and cloisters with their vows, and come out into the true Christian orders, so that one may escape the abominations of masses and of blasphemous sanctity, as *virginity*, *poverty*, *obedience*, by which they attempt to be saved. For, praiseworthy as it was in the beginning of the Christian Church to

observe the state of virginity, so horrible is it now, since by it they deny the help and grace of Christ; for it is possible to live as a virgin, widow and in chastity without such horrible abominations.

As to pictures, bells, vestments, churchly ornaments, altars, candles and the like, I regard them as coming within the domain of liberty; whoever wishes, may omit them. Although pictures representing Scriptural scenes and scenes from reliable history are very useful, yet I regard their use as free and optional; for I do not side with the iconoclasts.

Finally, I believe in *the resurrection of all the dead*, both of the pious and the wicked, at the last day, so that each shall receive in his body according to his deeds, and thus the pious enjoy everlasting life with Christ, and the wicked suffer everlasting death with the devil and his angels. For I do not agree with those who teach that the devils also will be finally saved.

This is my faith, for thus all true Christians believe and thus the Holy Scriptures teach us. And of that which may be lacking here my books will bear sufficient witness, especially those that have appeared of late, within the last four or five years. I beg all pious hearts to bear witness to this and to pray for me that I may remain steadfast in this faith to the end of my days. For if in great trials or in perils of death I should (which may God in mercy prevent) say something different, it shall have no force, and I wish hereby to have confessed openly that it is wrong and instigated by the devil. May my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, blessed forevermore, help me. Amen.

Chapter III.

THE HARMONY OF EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE.

“**W**HAT king,” says our Lord, “going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?” (Luke 14, 31). Therefore we, too, before we begin the refutation of the errors of the other Confessions, will first take a summary view of the strength of our Evangelical faith. True, we cannot in a few strokes present the whole length and breadth of its riches, and its height and depth far exceed all human thought and comprehension. But as God allowed His Son to be wrapped in swaddling clothes, so He is pleased also to permit us to dip out of the endless ocean of His grace with the poor vessels of human words.

The central point, the very kernel of Evangelical doctrine, however, is the justification of the sinner through grace, for Christ’s sake, by faith. The fourth article of the Augsburg Confession says: “Also they teach, that men cannot be justified before God by their own powers, merits, or works, but are justified freely for Christ’s sake, through faith, when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are forgiven

for Christ's sake, who by His death has satisfied for our sins. This faith God imputes for righteousness before Him. Rom. 3 and 4." Here that blessed truth which Luther had experienced, and which had lifted him out of the agony of doubt to the happiness of blessed assurance, is clearly and accurately stated. He had, according to the precepts of the Church, tried to merit the forgiveness of sins by all manner of works and mortifications of the flesh in the cloister. Nothing had helped him. He still had to cry out in anguish: My sins, sins, sins! and the dread of the righteous Judge had not departed from him. Then he was reminded of the word: I believe the forgiveness of sins. And now there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; now he understood, what he had never understood before, what the Scriptures mean when they speak of "righteousness." What Luther had been permitted to live through and experience, by the grace of God, in the deep anguish and distress of his soul, was confirmed to him by the testimony of the Holy Scriptures. Yes, it was only as guided by this Word that he arrived at a clear understanding of what God had wrought in his heart. And now he drank deeper and deeper at the fountain of God's Word. From this Word he derived strength to contend boldly against Romish error; it furnished him the weapons for his manifold battles in behalf of pure doctrine. He became still better and better acquainted with the Word, and from this pure source he derived treasure upon treasure of truth and knowledge. As he looked upon the Holy Scriptures, so does also the Church which

is named after him. She knows that the grace of God must be realized and experienced in the heart, but she knows also that only *that* preaching and *that* doctrine are right which agree with the Holy Scriptures. But of this we have spoken above, and would only add one sentence yet of Luther by way of confirmation: "Let him that wants to be guided and not err look to these two things, viz: Who can bring proof for his doctrine from the Scriptures and actual experience, as we can prove our doctrine and preaching. For, God be praised, I too can preach from experience, that no work could help or comfort me against sin and God's judgment, but Christ alone comforts the heart and conscience, and I have the whole Bible as a witness for this, and the example of many pious people, who say this too and have experienced it. On the contrary, all the schismatics can prove and establish nothing either from their own experience or that of other people." — *Justification* by faith alone, as witnessed by the Scriptures, this then is the cornerstone on which Luther built the temple of the knowledge of the Gospel plan of salvation, the corner-stone on which Rome's error was wrecked.

Let us turn again to the true Scriptural doctrine of justification. We do not justify ourselves, nor are we changed by the Sacraments, in that new powers for good are put into us, as for instance we help a well-worn clock movement by putting a new spring into it. No; God regards us graciously for Christ's sake and in Christ; He does not impute our sin to us. And on our part only this is required, that we *believe*, *i. e.* that

we have confidence in our gracious God. Not as though we were remodeled: "I feel," says Luther, "that I have been very wicked and am so still, and still I must say: All my sins are forgiven, for to me this word has been spoken: Thy sins are forgiven thee!" Thus we who remain poor sinners are still just and blessed in our confidence in the grace of God. No merit on our part brings this about, even faith itself is no such merit; it is only the beggar's hand which we extend toward the immeasurably rich Benefactor, and even this is the gift of God, wrought through the Holy Spirit.

This is the central point of Lutheran doctrine. Standing upon this we can easily look at all other doctrines, for they are all intimately connected with justification through grace for Christ's sake, through faith.

First let us lift our eyes to *the Triune God*. The sinner learns to know Him, the Triune, when he is justified. One Almighty, Eternal Lord, who is One, and still not One! We know the *Father* who has created us, whose law we are under obligation to fulfill in every respect, and who is angry with us sinners with a holy, righteous wrath. No one who has experienced this wrath will any longer take delight in the expression "dear Lord," as now understood, as though God were a weak, indulgent Father — as, for instance, Eli was. But, in the second place, we know also *Jesus Christ, the God-man*. Truly: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh!" In Him alone are we justified.

But, in the third place, that faith through which we receive justification is wrought in our hearts by God Himself. It is *God the Holy Ghost* who does this and who, living and acting, continually operates in our hearts. Thus then every one who has been justified knows God as the Triune God. And although he may not be able fully to understand how these three can be one, he still holds fast to it, for he has learned it by experience. And who would declare that which he had learned by actual experience to be an error, because he can not at once understand the relation of the several parts to each other?

The justified Christian looked upward to the Triune God; now he looks down and sees before him Golgotha, with the cross of Jesus Christ. His justification tells him further that *Jesus Christ alone is our Redeemer*. But in order that Christ might stand in our place in the presence of God's wrath, it was necessary that He should be very God as well as very man, and that not only once or for the time being, but even now yet. As there on the cross on Golgotha all the eternal love of God burned in the heart of the dying Savior, so to-day yet a human heart beats up there in heaven in the Triune God. Intimately and inseparably Divinity and humanity are united in the person of Jesus. For only as such can He be and remain our sole Mediator. Luther says in the Church Postil: "But if the wrath of God is to be taken away from me and I am to receive grace and forgiveness, it must be secured for me by some one; for God cannot look with favor upon sins, He can not be gracious nor re-

move the punishment and wrath, except some one has earned it of Him. Now, for the eternal, irreparable loss and everlasting wrath of God which by our sins we have merited, no one could render satisfaction, not even an angel in heaven, except the eternal Person, God's Son Himself, and that in this way, that He placed Himself in our stead, took upon Himself our sins, answered for them as though He Himself were guilty, etc. This our dear Lord and only Savior and Mediator before God, Jesus Christ, has done by the shedding of His blood and His death, when He became a sacrifice for us, and by His holiness, innocence and righteousness cancelled, nay, completely destroyed all sin and wrath under which He was placed for us, and offered merit so complete that God is now satisfied and says: He who obtains His help, has help indeed."

But furthermore, justification directs our view *within*. Here we learn to know our *sin*. That cannot be a matter of indifference for which the Son of God was nailed to the cross. Our sin is a great power. As such the sinner who is justified by grace learns to know it. It clings to him not only externally, as though it originated merely in his sensuality; nor did he get it from bad example. No, his innermost being, his heart, is poisoned by it, and it has always been in him, so that he has no recollection of his first sin. He is a sinner from the beginning. This is *original sin*. But although conceived and born in sin, as the Scriptures say, man still realizes his sin as *guilt*. He knows that he is accountable to God, for he delighted in sin-

ning, and did not groan under the burden of a foreign, irresistible power.

The justified man's sins are now *forgiven*. The grace of God convinces him of this; as a result of grace he learns to know his sin better and better, confesses it still more heartily, so that the new life which God has implanted in him increases from day to day. *What then is grace?* Justification gives the answer also to this question. According to the Romish doctrine grace is a new power imparted to man which destroys sin in him and works in him good thoughts and deeds. But we who are justified were not remodeled, as it were, the same sins and infirmities which formerly clung to us still remaining. And the old Adam within must daily die by sorrow and repentance. Grace therefore is something different: it is the *gracious disposition* of God toward us. Therefore the forgiveness of sin is its chief work in our behalf.

Now grace does not come upon us suddenly and without means. He in whom it has wrought repentance, faith and justification, knows that it employed certain *means* for this purpose. What means, dear reader, afforded you a taste of the grace of God? They were the *Means of Grace*, the Word and the Sacraments. First of all the *Word*. Where God and grace are spoken of, whether it be in church or in school, whether it be a mother who instructs her child and teaches it to pray, or two friends speak earnestly with each other concerning God and His grace, or some one reads the Bible or a devotional book, in every instance

God Himself is present, His Holy Spirit speaks in and through the human words to the human heart. Therefore we call such human words God's Word. Whether it deserve such title of honor is determined by this, viz: whether its contents agree with the revealed Word, the Bible. — In addition to this Means of Grace, the Word, our Church recognizes only two Sacraments. First, *Baptism*, by which man, among us generally an infant, is brought into communion with the Triune God, his sins are forgiven and he is saved, becoming a fellow-citizen of the kingdom of God. Luther says in the Large Catechism: "For we do not baptize anybody to make him a prince, but, as the words say, that he may be saved. But to be saved, as is well known, is nothing else than to be redeemed from sins, death and the devil, to come into the kingdom of Christ and live with Him forever." Now whilst Baptism among us translates children into the kingdom of Christ, God entering into communion with their hearts, the *Lord's Supper* strengthens us in such communion with God. Here Christ the Lord, as He is, God and man at the same time, approaches us in His glorified corporeality, in, with and under the bread and wine, to assure us by His presence of the forgiveness of our sins, to strengthen our faith and edify our hearts.

But wherever the Means of Grace are, there is also a congregation which uses them and thus perpetuates and edifies itself. Thus, then, we are led from the Means of Grace to the *Church*. "Whoever would find Christ," says Luther, "must first of all find the Church.

How could any one know where Christ and faith are, if he did not know where His believers are? And whoever would know anything about Christ, must not trust himself nor build his own bridge to heaven by his own reason, but must go to the Church, visit and ask her * * * for outside of the Church there is no truth, no Christ, no salvation." But why is this so? Because the true Church really proclaims the Word of God and administers the Sacraments according to the institution of Christ. This, then, is the essential thing in the Church, that the Word and Sacraments are rightly used, and not all manner of ceremonies and ordinances instituted of men. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is the true Church because she does this and rightly uses the Word of God. For to her we may apply what Luther says: "If we knew of a Church in the world where we could hear God's voice, how we ought to hurry to that Church! And still we would hear nothing different from what we hear in the Church at home from the pastor." — Two things follow from what has been said. In the first place, what the real duty of the ministerial office is. It is the office of preaching. To proclaim the Word and administer the Sacraments, this is its whole duty. In the second place, from what has been said we learn who those are who, in the full and proper sense of the word, belong to the Church. For, as is well known, in addition to true Christians there are many hypocrites and nominal Christians in the Church, just as in a field there are tares along with the wheat. Now just as the wheat-field gets its name not from the tares,

but from the wheat in it, so the Church is the body of Christ (Eph. 1, 22. 23; Rom. 12, 4. 5), the bride of Jesus Christ and His wife (Eph. 5, 23 sq.; 2 Cor. 11, 2; Rev. 21, 9), the house of God (Eph. 2, 20-22; Heb. 3, 6; 1 Peter 2, 5) only in so far as she contains true, genuine, *i. e.* believing Christians. In this sense Luther says of the Church that "a child of seven years, thanks be to God, knows what the Church is, namely, the sanctified believers and the sheep who hear the voice of their Shepherd."

But the true "sanctified believers," who make up the Church, are not perfect; they struggle and strive to advance further. This brings us to the doctrine of *sanctification* and of *Christian life*. The justified Christian has entered into communion with God. He cannot continue in this communion unless he try with all his might to become a new man more and more. In the severe conflict against flesh and blood, amidst all the pains of sorrow and repentance, by the grace of God, faith has been kindled in him. The conflict with sin continues throughout life, for sin assumes ever new forms and employs ever new means for temptation. It is a holy warfare, this conflict for self. The end in view in this warfare is to become more and more, with all our powers, what we have already, by the grace of God, become in the depth of our heart, namely children of God. God has imparted to us faith. God also draws us further up to Himself. In the first place our eye was directed to God in faith, soon God draws nearer and nearer to us and our personal communion with Him now constrains us.

also to conform our lives to His will. Thus works proceed from faith, as Luther says: "O what a living, busy, active, powerful thing is faith, so that it cannot help but continually do good. It does not stop to ask whether good works should be done, but before any one asks, it has done them and is continually doing them. Whoever does not do such works is devoid of faith, gropes about looking for faith and good works, and knows neither what faith nor what good works are, and still gossips and makes many words about faith and good works." So then the exercise of faith in love necessarily belongs to a living faith. It is the "faith which worketh by love" (Gal. 5, 6). But the Lutheran Christian does not aim at works of special extraordinary holiness, but seeks to practice love in his daily *calling*. Of that monkish ideal of life the Augsburg Confession says (Art. 16): "They condemn also those that place the perfection of the Gospel, not in the fear of God and in faith, but in forsaking civil offices; inasmuch as the Gospel teaches an everlasting righteousness of the heart. In the meantime it does not abolish civil government, or the domestic state, but requires urgently the preservation and maintenance thereof, as of God's own ordinances, and that in such ordinances we should exercise love."

The Christian is enabled to persevere in such excellent life of faith, for he stands in covenant relation with God: God has become his Father. This ever gives him the joyful assurance that his sins are forgiven, and furthermore the conviction that nothing, whether they be ills, or necessities, or calumnies, or

persecutions, can harm him. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Rom. 8, 31). In the end everything must work together for our good. Finally it follows from that communion with God, that the believing Christian — again in covenant relation with God — always can and should be prepared to do good works. "The conclusion of all this is" — thus Luther closes his precious book on the liberty of a Christian, in which these questions are discussed — "that a Christian lives not unto himself, but in Christ and unto his neighbor: in Christ through faith, unto his neighbor through love. Through faith he ascends beyond himself to God, from God he again descends beneath himself through love, and yet always abides in God and divine love."

He to whom God has manifested such wonderful love as to adopt him as His child in justification, is blessed here on earth already. But who does not know that sin and want continually darken and interrupt this blessedness? Therefore there can be no truly Evangelical Christian who does not cherish a longing for the breaking of that great day when we shall be united with our God forever. Such longing for our home dare never be wanting in our hearts, for we are only strangers here below. Now the Word of God teaches us, that it is not in vain that we cherish such longing and hope. If this Word has confirmed everything that the grace of God permitted us to experience, should we not grant that that too is true which it says of that which we have not yet experi-

enced, but to which our heart's most sacred longings continually point like the magnetic needle to the pole?

Who knows how soon the call may be extended even to us: "Give an account of thy stewardship!" Then you will be lying upon your last bed of sickness, knowing that the end is near! O, how your sins will then hover around your bed! They will encircle you like serpents threatening to drag you down to destruction like leaden weights! But you are justified by faith, you know that your sins are forgiven in Christ, therefore cling to your Savior! Do not forsake Him, He will not forsake you!

Lord Jesus Christ, true Man and God,
Who borest anguish, scorn, the rod,
And diedst at last upon the Tree,
To bring Thy Father's grace to me:
I pray Thee, through that bitter woe,
Let me, a sinner, mercy know.

When comes the hour of failing breath,
And I must wrestle, Lord, with death,
When from my sight all fades away,
And when my tongue no more can say,
And when mine ears no more can hear,
And when my heart is racked with fear,

When all my mind is darkened o'er,
And human help can do no more;
Then come, Lord Jesus! come with speed,
And help me in my hour of need;
Lead me from this dark vale beneath,
And shorten then the pangs of death.

— *Paul Eber.*

And then when the soul has left the body, what will it experience on entering the strange land? We

do not know, nor should we brood over it too much; but we do know that the soul of him who died in Christ cannot be snatched from His arms. Being with Him, all is well.

In the meanwhile the years on earth are passing away until the time be fulfilled; the signs appear which our Lord said would come to indicate the end. Hatred against the Gospel, nay against Christ Himself, lifts its head ever more boldly. "That man of sin" appears as Antichrist, demanding for himself that worship which we give to Christ (2 Thess. 2, 4). Then, when the greatest distress shall have come, the Son of Man, shall appear upon earth to judge all men. The dead arise; time is merged into eternity. Here on this earth, in a glorified body like that of our Lord after His resurrection, we shall live in the bliss of His love, in the blessedness of everlasting peace. Communion with God was our blessedness here below, it will be our salvation in eternity: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev. 21, 3. 4)!

This salvation, however, we shall experience on the glorified earth and in our body. It is hard for our natural reason to understand how this body which shall have fallen a prey to corruption and worms shall again live. But do we know of any other being-alive

than that in our body, or can we at all imagine any other than such a life for ourselves? Or should anything be impossible with God? Luther gives a strong answer to this in commenting on St. Paul (1 Cor. 15, 35 sq.), in these words: "This article is written in the field and in the garden and painted before your eyes, and your field and farm, on which you have sown the seed, can teach you what you are to think of the resurrection of the dead. When summer begins, the corn comes up out of the earth, and if it has sunshine, rain and favorable weather, it thrives, grows, puts forth ears, blooms, stands there as a thing of joy and shows no sign of decay, no death as formerly in winter, but only a pleasurable form and life. As the corn is sown in the ground, decays in the earth and again comes up out of the earth and, as it were, arises from the dead before our eyes: so too we will be sown into the earth like the corn. But we shall lie in the earth and decay only through the winter; at the last day, when our summer begins, our corn will spring up so that we shall see not only the green blade, but a strong, full ear, and shall be rich farmers, that is, be saved forever. For this the rain, the sunshine and the wind: the Sacraments and the Holy Spirit, are preparing us."

But not all to whom the message of the grace of God in Christ came accepted it. He who would not, although God called him, he who persistently resisted, will be given over to everlasting destruction. Without God, tormented by the excruciating memory of former sinful lust, from which now the flattering veil has been lifted, surrounded by malice and wickedness—

this is *hell*. Do not murmur against this awful end of perhaps many a rich human life! He who spent the time of his life in alienating himself—as to his inner life—from God, he who has thrust from him the arms of eternal love extended toward him, how could he spend his eternity with God and in His presence? The fault lies not in God, but in man alone. He is far from God; to be far from God means to be in misery and in distress. He who condemned himself to the hardening of his heart against everlasting truth—he shall be damned. And, finally, if you ask: What will become of the many who here on earth never heard of God and God's grace, of the children who die unbaptized?—I answer: I do not know, for God has not revealed it unto us. But one thing I do know: God's love is infinitely greater and richer than our love. If our love asks again and again for means to help these poor ones—should God's love not have means and ways which we know not? God is love! (1 John 4, 16). For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen! (Rom. 11, 36).

We have now placed before our minds a brief sketch of the structure of Christian doctrine. We have looked up at the height and down at the depth of Christian truth concerning God's grace, with admiration; have also cast a hasty glance at the length and breadth of the same. This, then, is the exceeding glorious, saving truth of the Gospel most purely and fully, most clearly and thoroughly developed in the confessional writings of our Church, in whose crown

shines Luther's Small Catechism (which a pious prince wished to take with him to his grave), not as the least pearl. This confessional crown is, therefore, well worthy that we hold it fast, that no man take it from us. To this end let us once more call to mind what labor the Church has ever had, to bring forth the divine treasures of doctrine which lie hidden in the Scriptures; what struggles she has had to endure, in order to transmit to us without corruption and loss the alone saving Word of the Lord, and of His prophets and apostles; how many sighs have gone up to the Lord of the Church; how many bitter tears have been shed, nay, how many precious drops of blood have also been spilt by men who did not value their lives, and of whom the world was not worthy.

But let us not only hold fast the form of sound words, and keep that good thing which was committed to us by our Fathers, but, most of all, let us also take firm root in the word of our confession, and submit to the Order of Salvation so clearly pointed out therein, in true repentance and faith, in order that we may also adorn the doctrine of our Savior with a holy walk in all things, and may let our light so shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven, which has made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Let us not forget, therefore, that the Church has her foundation in the holy mountains (Ps. 87, 1), that she is, therefore, to be not only a firm, but also a far shining city — a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid, that by no fault of ours the Church, in which

God's honor dwells, may be evil spoken of; especially in this our day, when so many, as David says, come that they may see, and their hearts gather iniquity within them, and they go forth to tell it. Especially at this time, when the city of God has such bitter enemies, that, as Asaph says, * * * "they break down the carved work thereof at once with axes and hammers." Especially at this time, when the Church, in nearly all parts of our country, has reason to pray with Asaph in the same Psalm: "Remember Thy congregation which Thou hast redeemed; this Mount Zion, wherein Thou hast dwelt. Forget not the voice of Thine enemies; the tumult of those that rise up against Thee increaseth continually."

Finally, let us call to mind that the Church is therefore also called a city which has her foundation in the mountains, because in her we are to lift up our heads above all earthly things toward that heavenly Jerusalem, that holy city, which John, in the spirit, saw coming down from God, out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; and let us ever learn more fervently to exclaim with the poet:

Jerusalem, thou city fair and high,
Would God I were in thee!
My longing heart fain, fain to thee would fly,
It will not stay with me;
Far over vale and mountain,
Far over field and plain,
It hastes to seek its Fountain,
And quit this world of pain.

Second Part.



Distinctive Doctrines of the Different
Christian Confessions.

Chapter I.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE ROMISH CHURCH.

THE Council of Trent and the Romish Catechism¹ are the two chief Confessions of the Romish Church, which adorns herself with the beautiful name Catholic (*i. e.* universal), and claims to be the only saving church.

The errors enumerated below are chiefly taken from the two above mentioned works; but we must remark, in the outset, that on many points — especially as regards the veneration of the images of saints, and of relics, penances, merit of saints, indulgences and purgatory — the doctrine of the Romish Church, as contained in her confessional writings, looks much more evangelical than it is found in her life, pulpits and schools (see II. 2. Remark).

The Romish Church teaches:

I. In the Article Concerning the Word of God.

1. The apocryphal books of the Old Testament are of the same divine authority as the canonical books.

Against this observe: They are indeed “useful and good to be read,” but can lay no claim to equal divine authority with the canonical; for *a*, they have their origin in a period of time after the last prophet, Malachi, which must already create doubt; *b*, they have not a single evidence in their favor

¹Catechismus Romanus.

from the mouth of the Lord or His Apostles; *c*, they were not among the sacred Scriptures of the Jews of Palestine, to whom, however, were entrusted "the oracles of God" (Rom. 3, 2), and whose judgment is therefore of the greatest importance in this matter; *d*, the Apocrypha have a spirit different from that of the canonical Scriptures, as may readily be observed by noting the mania for miracles and outward morality which most of them commend.

2. The Latin translation of the Bible by the Church Father Jerome of the fifth century (called *Vulgate*) "shall be considered authentic (*i. e.* correct and authorized) in public readings, disputes, sermons and explanations, and no one shall under any pretense dare or presume to reject it."

Against this observe: Such high, indisputable authority belongs only to the original text, as being inspired of God (2 Pet. 1, 21), but in no case to a human translation, not even the best; much less to the Vulgate, which can be shown to be false in many places. Compare, for instance, Gen. 3, 15, where the Latin translation reads "*She* shall bruise thy head"; hence the passage is applied to Mary.

3. It is the exclusive privilege of the Holy Mother Church "to decide on the true sense and the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and no one shall dare to explain them contrary to the sense which the Church regards as correct and against the universal consensus of the Fathers (which, however, has no existence!), even if such explanation should never be made public."

Against this observe: Inasmuch as the Word of God proceeds from the Holy Spirit, it must of course be spiritually discerned (1 Cor. 2, 10-16, especially v. 14), *i. e.* it can be rightly understood only by those in whose hearts the Holy Ghost dwells, namely by the living members of the Christian

Church. And herein rank or calling does not necessarily make any difference, for they shall *all* be taught of God, says the Scripture (John 6, 45). Now in this sense the Church, *i. e.* the communion of believers, alone has the true understanding of the Scriptures. But under the term "Mother Church" our opponents by no means understand all the living members of the Christian Church, but exclusively the general Council of Bishops; thus only a small part of the Church (which, moreover, is taken only from a certain rank, the ministry), often also only a single member of the same, the pope; and, which is worst of all, without regard as to whether the Holy Ghost dwells in their hearts or not, or whether they are living members of the Christian Church or not.

Remark: There is indeed a difference between the understanding (*Verständniss*) and explanation (*Auslegung*—*exegesis*) of the Scriptures; the latter requires a certain degree of scientific knowledge (the original languages of the Holy Scriptures, the history and doctrines of those times, etc.) and a special gift of the Holy Ghost. But these two requirements do not belong exclusively to bishops, or to any ecclesiastical office.

4. Oral tradition is of equal authority with the written Word of God in the Bible; indeed, it is the former which enables us clearly to ascertain the dark sense of Scripture, as also to supplement the contents of Scripture (and, in this respect, stands even above Scripture).

Against this observe: The Lord and the Apostles did indeed speak more than has been recorded, and among the first congregations many a word of theirs may have been transmitted from mouth to mouth; but, on account of human sin and weakness, no firm reliance whatever can be placed in oral tradition, and the written Word can therefore not be measured by it; nay, this (tradition) must be measured by that (the written Word: Acts 17, 11; 2 Pet. 1, 19). Besides the

error consists not in this, that in a general way traditions are accepted (indeed we accept an interpretation of Holy Writ transmitted to us from past ages), but in this, that apostolic authority is ascribed to such tradition, and in this, that it is made the basis of articles of faith. The sacrifice of the mass with its usages, the tonsure of the priests, ordination, the position of the pope, the idea that matrimony is a sacrament, the immaculate conception of Mary, extreme unction, purgatory — these, for instance, are such doctrines as no one who has a conscientious regard for historical truth would attempt to trace back to apostolic institution. Every thing that the Church, in the course of time, has invented, or still invents, is to be clothed with apostolic authority. Pope Pius IX. expressly declares: "Tradition am I"! — Besides, we cannot fail to observe that in all things necessary to our salvation the Holy Scriptures express themselves not only fully, but plainly¹

Remark: The use of the Bible by the laity was indeed never unconditionally forbidden by the Romish Church, but was gradually more circumscribed and rendered more difficult, until recently the Protestant Societies which labor for the circulation of the Scriptures were expressly condemned by the pope. In his syllabus Pope Pius IX. characterized them as moral pests, and placed them in the same category with Socialism, Communism and secret societies.

¹Wherever Scripture seems dark it treats of historical difficulties, concepts apparently contradictory, etc., and therefore things whose knowledge is not absolutely necessary to our salvation; and then the darkness lies not so much in the Scripture-words as in the things themselves, which are too high and incomprehensible to be spoken of here below otherwise than in riddles and mysteries (1 Cor. 13, 12). But often the darkness is in man who contemplates the word of God (Matt. 6, 23); for the understanding of the natural man is darkened by the blindness of his God-estranged heart (Eph. 4, 18), so that he cannot know it (1 Cor. 2, 14).

II. In the Article Concerning God.

1. We are not indeed to worship the angels and departed saints (among whom Mary, as the blessed Mother of Jesus, occupies the first rank), for supreme worship belongs to God alone; but we should call upon them for their intercession with God, seeing that such service of devotion is due to the angels and departed saints.

Against this observe: For this we have neither divine command nor divine promise. Besides, there is no doubt that the holy angels and perfected saints, without anything further on our part, unite their prayers in heaven with ours on earth, and thus add the incense of their prayers to that of ours (Rev. 5, 8, and 8, 3-4). We may also well imagine that they pray not only *with*, but also *for*, the Church militant on earth. But as to how far such intercession embraces the *especial* want of the Church, no one knows (Tobias 12, 12, is apocryphal), because no one can tell how far the saints in heaven are acquainted¹ with earthly wants. They are, at

¹In Heb. 12, 1 the perfected saints in heaven (see chap. 11) are indeed called a cloud of witnesses which encompasses us whilst we are striving here below. But it cannot be shown that they are called witnesses, because they watch us from above; it is equally probable that they are called witnesses because, by their words, conduct and sufferings, they have here below borne witness of their faith (chapt. 11), and we are in this sense "compassed about" by them, that their life of faith is presented to us in the word of God for our contemplation (chapt. 13, 7); even as the Apostle in the previous (11) chapt. placed one after another before our eyes. The latter explanation also agrees better with Isaiah 63, 15, 16, where it is said that God shall look down from heaven and behold the distress of the people, though Abraham and Israel be ignorant of them.

all events not — because this belongs to God alone — omnipresent and omniscient; so that he who, notwithstanding, applies to the angels and saints for their intercession with God, tacitly applies to them divine attributes, and thus, at best ignorantly, practices idolatry, and that too without any assurance of being heard.

Besides, we cannot separate supreme “worship” and “service” of devotion (Ex. 20, 5); the latter also belongs to God alone. Then too we must remember here that we men cannot know whether any one in heaven now occupies such an authoritative position or not. Even if we grant that the miracles entitling them to canonization were wrought on earth by the persons in question, this still would prove nothing. And if the pope now appoints men as patron saints, who are to pray for the Church, can this have any influence on what they do in heaven? Moreover, let us not forget how many saints are such only in legend, as for instance Christophorus; St. George; the 11,000 virgins who died at Cologne with St. Ursula rather than sacrifice their virginity; St. Anna, the reputed mother of the mother of our Lord, etc. Further, how very little we know of a host of other saints, to whom only common report ascribes the miraculous, as for instance St. Januarius, or the twenty-six Japanese martyrs, who are said to have suffered martyrdom at Nagasaki in 1597, and who were canonized by pope Pius IX. Looking at this matter more closely, we find that it is altogether without any foundation. Are the saints omnipresent, so that they can hear prayers offered at the same time in Germany and America? Or must God make these petitions known to them? Why not bring our cause directly to Him? And when people ascribe to the individual saint a special sphere of action, how groundless is this! On this subject the Apology of the Augsburg Confession very properly says: “With the learned this error also prevails, viz. that to each saint a particular ministration has been committed, that Anna bestows riches [protects from poverty], Sebastian keeps off pestilence, Valentine heals the epilepsy, George protects

horsemen. These opinions have clearly sprung from heathen examples. For thus among the Romans Juno was thought to enrich, Febris to keep off fever, Castor and Pollux to protect horsemen," etc. (Jacobs' ed. pp. 239 and 240).

Remark: That the Romish Church applies to the departed saints rather than to the angels for intercession with God is no mere accident; for, first, the departed saints were *humanly tempted*, and we may therefore speak with them more confidently (if not perhaps more confidentially) than with the angels; second, according to the Romish view they have had the opportunity of performing works of supererogation by voluntarily accepting the "Evangelical decrees" (against this see VII., 3) and can bring these to bear in their intercessions with God. That the Romish Church does not derive the efficacy which she ascribes to the intercession of the saints from the merits of Christ alone, but makes the interceding saints to be in fact propitiators with Him, is sufficiently evident from her public Confession, in which it is said expressly that Mary is to "reconcile" God through her intercession; and, in connection with this, reference is made to her "extraordinary merit with God."

2. We should especially call upon and implore Mother Mary, as the "Mother of compassion," for her help (and that, too, both in bodily and spiritual need).

Against this observe: What has been said against 1 applies also against 2. But that Mary is called a mother of compassion, whom we are especially to call upon and (mark well!) *implore*, has really no other sense than this. Mary, a woman of large sympathy, and a mother who suffered much pain, whose soul was pierced with a sword, is more compassionate than all the other saints; she can be moved by ardent supplications. (Here account is made of womanly weakness. See the next remark.)

Not very remote from this, and making its appearance to some extent in pulpits and writings, is the idea that she is,

after all, more merciful than God the Father (who never was tempted); nay, even more merciful than Jesus Christ (who as man [Mensch] has indeed a human heart, but by no means the sensitiveness of a feminine heart).

Remark: At the same time the Romish Church, if not in her Confessions, at least in her pulpits, schools and devotional writings fosters the false idea that Christ, as an obedient Son (Luke 2, 51), can deny His beloved mother no request, forgetting: 1, that even a *human* son should obey God rather than his parents (Acts 5, 29); 2, that Christ is not her Son only, but also her Lord and God; 3, that as to His human nature, according to which He is her Son, He has now laid aside the form of a servant; 4, that even then also when He walked in the form of a servant He was obedient to His parents only in those things which did not affect His office (John 2, 4).

Moreover, as evidence once for all that the doctrine of the Romish Church, as contained in her Confessions, even if read between lines, still looks much more evangelical than we find it in her pulpits and schools, we give here a few extracts from a sermon delivered in Naples, in November, 1887, on the occasion of the crowning of an image of the Madonna: "For the benefit of all who fear the majesty of the King, the Judge, the Savior, a woman is placed between heaven and earth. Where the King is, there the queen must be also; where the King beams in His greatness and power, she must make her mediation felt in the power of her protection, in her works of loving providence. Let us, then, hasten to the arms of Mary; she is the hope of our life. * * * Providence manifested itself for our fathers in a mother who watches over our destinies, an advocate (female) who pleads our cause, a queen who turns the keys of heaven at her pleasure. * * * Mary is the most holy among all creatures, the dispenser of all graces, the crowned queen of the universe, the mother of providence for men. * * * In the celebration of these days * * * this word is verified: The cultus of the excellencies of Mary is, in the

highest sense of the word, the cultus of Christianity. By placing the crown on Mary's head, we lift her up to the highest place in the cultus, and greet her as queen of heaven and earth. The hand of God has placed the crown on her head; who will dare to snatch it from her?—How beams the crown of thy Madonna! Rays of paradise go out from this crown which * * * penetrate the night of gloomy errors.—Whoever obliterates the cultus of Mary destroys woman. To deprive woman of her devotion to Mary is a satanic work. The devotion of women for the Madonna is co-existent with Catholicism, and this with the centuries.” (Given by Trede in his interesting book: “Heathenism in the Romish Church; images of religious and moral life in the South of Italy.” Gotha, 1889. The sermon was afterwards printed.) To this we add a collection of utterances, in glorification of Mary, taken from German periodicals. (Compare Reusch, *German Bishops and Superstition*, Bonn, 1879.) A German Jesuit speaking of Mary expresses the opinion that God has “accomplished the plan of redemption through the Savior and the Mother of God. They are our new progenitors. This is Mary's place in Christianity: to be our Mother. A mother cares for her children, and that in every respect. In a family everything passes through the hand and the heart of a mother. So too, in the Church, everything passes through the heart of Mary,” and then adds: “Mary is, as it were, the mild, gentle eye of God which looks upon the poor world and seeks out all the unfortunates.”—“Wherever,” we read elsewhere, “the great God puts forth efforts of His love, He has by an immutable, eternal decree connected Mary with them. * * * The sight of her has a determining influence on the plan of creation. * * * It was she with her divine Child who was presented to the first creatures, the angels, as their future queen, as soon as she had an existence.” In a manner perfectly consistent with this position of Mary the “Monthly Roses in honor of the Immaculate Mother of God, Mary” say that Christ now, since He has ascended to heaven, has certainly not relinquished

that obedience which He rendered to His mother for thirty years. "Even now yet, in His glorious exaltation, He shows a willingness to yield to His mother which closely resembles that obedience which He practiced during His mortal and hidden life in the house of Joseph and Mary." It is not surprising, therefore, if Mary, to end up with, is clothed with almost divine power and glory. In the periodical already quoted we read: Mary's "holiness is altogether superhuman and superangelic, it exceeds all comparison, all our powers of conception. She is lost in exaltation, in a kind of infinity, which is limited indeed when compared with the infinity of God, but comes nearest to it." "Mary shares equal honor and power with the Father, because, after the flesh, she is the Mother of Him who has proceeded from the Father from eternity. * * * Since she is the Mother of God she is at the same time the mistress of the whole world and the queen of heaven and earth. By her intercession she can do all that God can do by His omnipotence." "Nothing is done in heaven or on earth without her knowledge. She takes part in everything that enters into the most secret counsel of the most adorable Trinity." "That we have a Father of compassion (2 Cor. 1, 3) is in itself already exceedingly fortunate. But still this would not quite suffice to put us at ease. We need a mother also who will interest herself in our poverty, for, as the wise Sirach says (Ecclesiasticus 36, 21), 'Where no woman is, one sighs and suffers want.' It is enough to quote such expressions; they need no refutation, for every sensible person will see that the Holy Scriptures are against them!

3. The glorification of Mary finds its culminating point, however, in the dogma of the immaculate, sinless conception of Mary, proclaimed by Pius IX.

It was on the 8th of December, 1854, when Pope Pius IX., surrounded by 53 Cardinals, 43 Archbishops

¹Literal translation from the German. D. M. M.

and 100 bishops, assembled from all parts of the world, solemnly declared: "The doctrine, that the most holy Virgin Mary, in the first moment of her conception (i. e. not when she conceived the Lord of the Holy Ghost, but when she herself was conceived by her mother) by a special gift and grace of almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ the Savior of the human race, was kept and remained free from all taint of original sin, — is revealed of God, and must therefore be believed by the faithful."

Let us hear how one of the most eloquent defenders of the worship¹ of Mary expresses himself on this subject. He tells us, in the first place, how the pope, having directed a preliminary inquiry to all his venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and bishops of the whole Catholic world, received the most encouraging answers from all, and only then proclaimed this doctrine; then he continues: "We can not sufficiently emphasize the fact that in this matter Pius IX. used his authority only to recognize what was universally believed, to express his judgment on the timeliness of a more definite utterance, and to declare that that which always had been believed with reference to the immaculate conception now *must* be believed. * * * The pope only formulated the belief (faith) of the whole world and of antiquity. That it is the belief of the whole world is demonstrated by the answers of all the Churches — answers which

¹New Studies concerning Christianity. By August Nicolas. Translated from the French by Reiching. 1856-1860.

were in perfect agreement with each other, and which have the witness of miraculous power, since they came even from those ecclesiastical dignitaries who personally had doubts as to the timeliness of this matter. That it is the belief of antiquity is evident from the answers themselves; for they set forth not only what the generations now living believe, but after the departed generations had been questioned and, as it were, called up again by the examination of the testimonies and monuments which they have transmitted to us, they have all, as a result of the most careful and scrutinizing researches, confirmed the proposition, that this pious opinion has no other source than the Christian belief of the world. Thus the voice not only of heaven, but of all times as well as of all places, has spoken through the mouth of Pius IX., and one can apply to this great event what is said in the Apocalypse: 'From all parts of the creation I heard numberless voices, which came from heaven, from the earth and from *under the earth*, from the sea and from all that is in its vast domain, and they all said with a loud voice: She is pure, she is immaculate from her conception, the Virgin Mother of the Redeemer.'" From all these testimonies a venerable bishop, in giving his own testimony, drew the following ingenious and striking inference: "It has thus been demonstrated, not by vague surmises, but by historic monuments which cannot be controverted, that the view which favors the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary has been generally accepted, ever since the most ancient times, both by the Christian people, and also

by the shepherds of the Church. Now since there is no effect without an adequate cause, this belief, so common in the Church, must have a common origin; and since we have to deal with a fact which can be known only by divine revelation, we necessarily conclude that there has been, always and everywhere, in the Church, a tradition which confirms the revelation of this fact. This tradition may have been handed down to us clearly expressed in words; or we may take for granted that it was only implied in other doctrinal truths, especially those which relate to the mystery of the incarnation and of the divine maternity; but, whichever view we adopt, we shall always arrive at the same conclusion, viz. that this opinion of the Church, this truth, which excepts the conception of the Virgin Mary from the taint of original sin, can be traced back to the most remote ages, and is contained in the treasure of revealed faith."

According to such argumentation the difficulties of proof are indeed easily surmounted. The Scriptures however declare: "As by one man sin entered into *the world*, and death by sin; and so death passed upon *all* men, for that *all* have sinned" (Rom. 5, 12). If Mary were to have been excepted from this rule, the Scriptures would so declare, even as they do concerning our Lord. But, aside from the fact that such a declaration could not be wanting in the Scriptures if Mary's being conceived immaculate were to be an article of faith,—where is there even the slightest foundation for such tradition from mouth to mouth? It would necessarily have to rest on testimony of some

kind. Perhaps on the statement of Mary's parents? Impossible. Or on a special divine revelation? Where is the proof? But they leave room for another way out of the difficulty, viz. this, that the doctrine "is implied in other doctrinal truths." "The virgin motherhood of Mary includes her own immaculate conception. For the same reason for which Jesus had to have a *virgin* mother He had to be born of an *immaculate* mother." So says the author quoted above. Widely mistaken! The immaculate conception of our Lord by Mary by no means demands that she herself should have been conceived immaculate, only this much it demands, that the Holy Ghost should do for her, when she conceived the Lord, what, according to the Romish acceptance, He did for her parents when she was conceived. Why this roundabout way? True, the pope himself says: "It was *becoming* that the Only-begotten, just as He had a Father in heaven whom the Seraphim proclaim thrice holy, so on earth also should have a mother in whom the radiance of holiness was never wanting; more beautiful than beauty, more graceful than grace, more holy than holiness itself, who alone has become the dwelling of all the graces of the Holy Ghost, who stands above all, who is by nature more beautiful, more perfect, more holy than even the Cherubim and Seraphim and all the host of angels, and to praise whom the tongues of heaven and earth will by no means suffice." The "successor of Peter" seems indeed to understand very little about what is meet or not meet in heavenly things; Heb. 2, 10 sq. gives us a very different idea about

divine decorum. The divine Majesty is greatest in the lowliness of condescending mercy; therefore too "He hath regarded the low estate of his hand-maiden" (Luke 1, 48). He who did not regard it as unbecoming, in holy love, to offer His body on the accursed tree, could also not regard it as unbecoming to take it from the body of a mother resting under the curse of sin; He does not receive His holiness from anything without Himself, but, on the other hand, sanctifies everything where He enters with His holiness.

Even the Council of Trent did not have the courage boldly to announce the immaculate conception of Mary as an article of faith. Bossuet, who lived in the second half of the seventeenth century, expresses himself very characteristically in the catechism of Meaux. *Question*: "How do theologians generally regard the conception of the holy Virgin? *Answer*: That by a special grace it was immaculate, *i. e.* without taint and without original sin. *Ques.*: Has the Church given it out as a dogma that the conception of the Virgin was immaculate? *Ans.*: No, the holy See has declared that this has not yet been finally decided, and that it is neither heresy nor mortal sin not to believe it. *Ques.*: What must we see in this? *Ans.*: The great wisdom of the holy See, and the care which is here applied in proving the perpetual tradition of all ages."

Surely Pius IX. would also have done better not to allow himself to be determined by the mystic propensity of his own heart, by his Jesuitic Court-theologians, and his generally all too papistically inclined

bishops, to sanction this particular theological "admission" as an article of faith. By doing this he excited manifold discussions in the bosom of his own Church. For he thereby forsook her traditions. The greatest teachers of the mediæval Church, from Augustine down, rejected this doctrine; for instance, the greatest dogmatist of the middle ages, Thomas of Aquino, whom the Romish Church has canonized, and whose doctrines she has formally approved, in many passages defends the *maculate* conception as the only possible view — not to speak of many others.

4. In like manner we are to show the images of the saints, for the sake of the persons whom they represent, the respect and honor due them; (but the image of Christ we are to worship). This is done by kissing, uncovering the head, and prostration.

Against this observe: No upright Christian will show any disrespect to the image of a pious person (as for instance by hanging it in an improper place), or suffer it to be done; because this would have the appearance of being an intended insult to the man represented thereby, and would give offense; he will much rather honor it. But to this there belong neither marks of affection, as the kiss, nor of politeness, as uncovering the head, least of all religious postures, as prostration; and in general, no formal signs of honor and respect. These are not due to such images, devoid of merit and consciousness, not even for the sake of those whom they represent, who cannot impart to their images either their merit or their consciousness, and as far as they themselves are concerned, if they were still living, they would forbid formally prescribed marks of respect and veneration, especially when shown on account of their holy lives.

But as regards the image of Christ in particular, we know that Christ is circumscribed by no space, but is every where present (Eph. 4, 10). Now, as the image itself is not the object of worship, why this self-invented roundabout way, through the locally circumscribed image, which, 1, does not agree well with John 4, 20-24; and, 2, may lead to many other soul-destroying superstitions, as, for instance, the false notion that images possess a peculiar healing power. Indeed it ever has been, and in spite of the fact that the Council of Trent saw fit to condemn (on paper) such delusions, is still productive of them. We have abundant proof of this in those processions with their accompanying pathetic invocations, so many of which may be seen and heard, for instance, in Italy. We simply refer here, as one instance, to the "Bambino" — a puppet representing the Savior — which (for a consideration) is carried to the sick, in Rome and southern Italy, and confers healing upon them.

5. Finally, we are also to venerate the bodies of the martyrs and other saints, which were "temples" of the Holy Ghost, and are finally to be "transfigured."

Against this observe: The body of Mary was not only a temple of the Holy Ghost, but the Lord Himself derived therefrom His human nature, in which, from the beginning, the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily; yet the Lord saw fit to direct the attention of the woman, who praised the body of Mary, from such expressions to the alone-saving word (Luke 11, 28). But if we are not even to *praise* the bodies of the saints while *living*, much less should we venerate them when *dead*! That God is not well pleased therewith, He has plainly indicated, in that He Himself buried His servant Moses, evidently that no man might find his grave; and thus to prevent the idolatrous worship of his ashes in the future (Deut. 34, 6). Therefore, the highest honor which we may show the bodies of pious persons, on account of their edifying example, consists in this, that we give them an honorable burial, if possible "in the choice of our sepulchres" (Gen. 23,

6); but then let the dust rest with its dust (Gen. 3, 19) until all who are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Lord (John 5, 28-29). Only then will it be made manifest beyond a doubt which of the bodies of the so-called saints were "temples of the Holy Ghost," and the Lord, the omniscient and just Judge, will Himself in the transfiguration bestow upon each one the due degree of honor (1 Cor. 15, 38-41). At all events the Romish Church has no right to encourage her people to look to the bodies of the saints, or to portions of them, for healing and deliverance. This is simply superstition, which will divert the minds of the people and prevent the salutary influence which the good example of the saints might otherwise have, by reason of their faith, their love, their joyfulness in suffering, etc. What good can it possibly do if the pretended blood of St. Januarius, which is dried up in a bottle, becomes fluid again once a year? The fruit of such teaching may be seen in a prayer which was uttered from a pulpit in 1884 when cholera was epidemic in Naples: "O St. Gennare (Italian for Januarius), where cholera desolates our plains and causes so much untold misery, do thou to-day show *the angry eternal One thy blood*, then the chastisement will cease, then will the grateful fatherland bless thee and praise thy blood, which in manifest deeds shows the power it contains, a power which thou dost apply to the protection, welfare and honor of the so justly envied people of Naples. The blood shall be to you for a token" (Ex. 12, 13; the text of this sermon!). In opposition to this the Scriptures say that we have "*boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus!*" (Heb. 10, 19). The cloister of Mater Domini (the mother of our Lord), not far from Vesuvius, has a bottle containing some of the holy Virgin's milk. The printed chronicles of the cloister say, with reference to it: "Since Mary is *the mother and co-redeemer of the Church*, should she not have left *a few drops of her precious milk as a gift* for this Church, just as we still have some of the blood of Christ?" etc., etc. Here again we can see that their practice is far worse than their doctrine. These examples are

taken from the work of Trede already referred to in the Remark under II. 2.

Remark: In close connection with this stands the whole subject of saints' relics; for if we are not to worship the bodies of the saints, much less such things as belonged to them. But how far this matter of (often only pretended) relics is still carried may be seen for instance, in the case of *the holy coat at Treves*. In the year 1844, namely, a brownish garment was exposed for veneration at Treves. It was said to be the seamless coat of Christ. Presently great multitudes of pilgrims (1,100,000) came to pay homage to this coat. Miracles, it was claimed, were also wrought. But now it was shown by Protestant investigators that in twenty other places there were also coats of Christ, or at least parts of such. Where, then, is the true coat? And how many phases of superstition could here be added yet; one need only think of the many pieces of the cross of Christ, etc.

6. Through such relics God confers many benefits on men, especially the healing of the sick.

Against this observe: Acts 5, 15; 19, 12 and 2 Kings 13, 21, to which the Romish Church usually refers, prove nothing in favor of this. In the first passage, namely, it is not said that the shadow of Peter wrought healing; in the second such things are spoken of as belonged, not to an ordinary saint, but to an Apostle gifted with miraculous powers; and in the third we read of the bones, not of an ordinary saint, but of a prophet, possessing miraculous power. Besides, it may be asked, did not God perhaps by way of exception—in order to establish the doctrine of the Apostle, according to His promise in Mark 16, 17 and 20—condescend in this way to the weak faith of the people, as Christ did in the case of the woman who had an issue of blood, who thought that by touching Him she would receive aid without His knowledge? (Matt. 9, 21.) In no case can man *induce* extraordinary divine dispensations in his own way.

Supplement. At this point, in the Article concerning God, we must refer yet to the many kinds of miraculous means which modern Ultramontaniam is bold enough to recommend for the healing of the body and the salvation of the soul; for they too, when compared with a true understanding of the Gospel, rob God of that honor which belongs to Him alone. The much praised *scapularies*, *i. e.* two pieces of woolen goods connected by a cord, and worn on the chest and back, under the clothing, occupy the first place. Different orders have different scapularies, brown, white, blue, black and red. They vouchsafe ample indulgence and protect from all kinds of bodily harm. But if the five scapularies are worn at once, one over the other, their blessing becomes immeasurable! Then we may mention the *medal of St. Benedict*, of the order of the Benedictines. Its benefits are similar to those of the scapularies. When placed under the pillows of unbelievers they were at once converted; drunkards suddenly had a distaste for strong drink; heretics were converted; evil spirits driven away; all kinds of diseases, even toothache and nose-bleeding, were cured; frightened horses were rendered tractable, hens induced to lay, a cow and a cat afflicted with skin disease were cured by it.

The wearing of *holy girdles*, especially the seraphic girdle of St. Francis, a strong cord bound around the body under the clothing, also secures untold benefits. It secures to the wearer all the blessings of the order of Franciscans. In a work translated from the French we read: "As often as they (the wearers of the girdle) pray six *Pater nosters*, etc., they secure for themselves all the indulgences of the holy land, of all the Basilicas and sanctuaries of Rome and Assisi, *i. e.* thousands of plenary indulgences, and partial indulgences for at least more than one hundred thousand years. Is not this a memorable ocean of mercy? Can we not, in this way deliver thousands of souls from purgatory every day?"—For similar purposes the Jesuits offer the *Ignatius water*, consecrated by the touch of a relic of the

saint. The drinking of this water has effected many conversions, restored to health those who were sick unto death, etc. Similar claims are made for the *gracious water of Lourdes* and Marpingen, where the blessed Virgin is said to have appeared and herself declared the "immaculate conception." Finally we may yet mention the cultus of the heart of Jesus, as well as the heart of Mary. Not the heart as the symbol of love is meant in connection with these devotions, but, as a German Bishop (Martin of Paderborn) wrote: "The true object of devotion * * * is the *real heart of Jesus*, not simply the love symbolized by the heart." "The bodily heart" of Jesus and of Mary are now invoked. Pius IX. promised indulgence to those who use the prayer beginning with the words: "Remember, O our dear Lady of the holiest heart, the unlimited power which thou hast over the heart of thy adorable Son." And Bishop Martin writes: "By the adoration of the heart of Mary I receive, as it were, access to the heart of Jesus. For, who else besides Mary can obtain for me the grace necessary for true love and adoration of the divine heart?" Besides this they speak also of the invocation of the heart of Joseph. "The three holiest hearts" are invoked together.—Reusch, in his little book "The German Bishops and Superstition" (Bonn, 1879), reports this and a great deal more from writings endorsed by the Romish Church.—In view of such horrible ultramontane excrescences, are we not justified in charging them with the use of amulets and sorcery? Such superstitious practices require no refutation; we need only to call to mind that we may and are commanded to worship the Lord our God alone, and to call upon Him in all times of bodily and spiritual need.

III. In the Article Concerning Man.

1. The original divine similitude of the first man (*i. e.* his original holiness, righteousness and wisdom)

was only a superadded gift. (Hence man lost nothing essential when he lost it in the fall.)

Against this observe: In Gen. 1, 27 it is simply said that God *created* man in His own image (*i. e.* as we learn from Eph. 4, 24 and Col. 3, 10, in perfect righteousness, holiness and wisdom); but it is not said that He first created him, and afterwards added His image, or similitude. Hence the loss of the divine image through the fall is not to be regarded only as a want of original power in the sight of God, but as an actual depravity which has come upon human nature.

"Adam's purity and integrity of being did not consist only of perfect physical health and of blood, thoroughly pure, or of unimpaired strength of body, but the greatest property of this noble first creature was a light shining in the heart, by which a knowledge of God and of His works was communicated—a real fear of God—a truly sincere confidence in Him, and in all respects a genuine, correct understanding, and a heart overflowing with love, goodness and joyfulness towards God and all divine things." (Apol. Art. II. Jacobs' ed. p. 78.)

2. The inborn sensual lust, as long as it is not expressed in any deed, is not sinful (is much rather intended to afford an opportunity for the practice of the opposite virtue).

Against this observe: The Apostle Paul expressly calls it sin in Rom. 7, 7-9, and in Matt. 5, 28 the Savior says that sensual lust is in itself a deed, namely, of the heart. Now if such an inward deed were no sin, why is it directly forbidden in the law, or Ten Commandments, by the words, "Thou shalt not covet?" Does the Romish Church not know the law? If she knows it, she must also know that lust is sin, as the Apostle Paul says, Rom. 7, 7. Again, if sensual lust were no sin, but much rather afforded us an opportunity for

the practice of virtue, why should we be so often and so earnestly admonished to crucify lust, this innocent aid to godliness? (Gal. 5, 24). And, finally, do we not all learn by experience that the root of all sinful deeds is in the evil lust of the heart? (James 1, 13-15).

"He (St. Paul) clearly declares concupiscence to be sin.
* * * Augustine also disputed with, and contended earnestly against, those who held that evil desires and inclinations in man were not sin, and were neither good nor bad, as having a black or white body is also neither good nor bad. * * * Every experienced Christian heart knows and feels, alas! that this evil—namely, that we esteem gold, property, and all other things, more highly than God, and proceed and live on in imagined security in them—is innate with us, and exists in our bodies. And they know and feel, furthermore, that according to the nature of our sensual security, we are always inclined to think that God's wrath and severity regarding sin are not so great as they really are. * * * Who will have the boldness to assert that these gross propensities are neither good nor bad? Again, that lust and evil thoughts in our hearts are not sins, if we do not fully consent to them? Before the world, it is true, thoughts are free and exempt from punishment. But God searches the heart: His judgments and His sentence are different." (Apol. Art. II. Jacobs' ed. pp. 81. 82).

3. By his first disobedience man's moral nature was not rendered altogether incapable of good, but was only to a certain extent weakened. The sinner is not like unto one dead, but unto one severely wounded.

Against this observe: Besides many other passages of the Holy Scriptures, the second half of the 7th chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, beginning at the 14th verse, is most decidedly and clearly opposed to this. Read this passage! Or can we speak of a partial ability to do good

in that man who, by nature, is "sold under sin (v. 14), and in captivity under the law of sin (v. 23), and in whose flesh dwelleth no good thing" (v. 18)? It still remains true then: "Our nature fell in Adam's fall, One common sin infects us all."

"For, since the fall of Adam, as the natural faculties of reason still remain, so that I can perceive good and bad in an object which may be contemplated by the power of thought and the operation of the mind, so there is also, to some extent, an ability in the freedom of will, to live honorably or dishonorably. This is termed by the Holy Scripture the righteousness of the law, or of the flesh. * * * But in spiritual matters, namely, truly to believe God, to cherish an assured confidence that He is near us, hears us, forgives our sins, etc., the liberty of the will and the powers of the mind can accomplish nothing." (Apol. Art. XVIII. Jacobs' ed., p. 230).

IV. In the Article Concerning the Work of Christ.

1. Christ, as true God, is infinite; hence His merit is also infinite, and thus more than sufficient to take away the guilt of men, which is finite, since sinning men themselves are finite beings.

Against this observe: If we wish to deal with mere logical conclusions, we may just as well turn the matter around, and say: Sinful men are indeed finite; but God, against whom they sin, is infinite, and thus their guilt is infinite.

But we simply hold fast to the Scripture, in which we have the most positive assurance that "Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2, 2); and thus His merit is altogether sufficient to take away the guilt of all men; whilst there is not a single passage from which it would appear that it is more than sufficient.

2. Notwithstanding the merit of Christ is more than sufficient to take away the guilt of men, still it blots out perfectly only the guilt of original sin; on the contrary, for the forgiveness of actual sin God demands personal satisfaction (which is not at all possible!) besides the merit of Christ, — and that to the end that we should not think too lightly of actual sin.

Against this observe: This is another invention of men, which cannot be proved by the Scriptures; these teach us, without any distinction, that the Lord has redeemed us from our sins; and in 1 John 1, 7 we read expressly: “The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin;” thus not only from original, but also from actual sin; and again, not only from this or that actual sin, but from each and every one. Hence “there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.” Rom. 8, 1.

V. In the Article Concerning faith.

Faith is an assent to that which the Church teaches.

Against this observe: It is true, knowledge and assent belong to faith in its Biblical sense, but as to its essence it is confidence (Heb. 11, 1). The first is a matter of the memory, the second of the understanding, the third of the heart; and this third is evidently the chief thing. For, what good will mere knowledge and assent do? Such faith the devils also have, and tremble (James 2, 14); such faith Judas had, who went and hanged himself.

Thus a heartfelt confidence, which the Romish Church omits, is really the saving, chief part of faith.

VI. In the Article Concerning Justification.

When God justifies the believing sinner for the sake of Christ, He not only ascribes to him the merit

of Christ, and *looks upon him* as just, but pours out into him the righteous nature of Christ and *makes him just*: in this sense, that not only all guilt, but also all sin is instantly taken away.

Against this observe: The Scriptures speak very clearly of an *imputation* of righteousness, but never of any essential *infusion* (Gen. 15, 6; Rom. 4, 3. 5. 6. 8). Spiritual experience also teaches that what takes place in our behalf when we are justified is not the imparting to us of something new, but that it concerns the personal relation between God and the sinner. We experience the 'gracious disposition of God, which no longer imputes to us our sins. And just as clearly does experience show that the justified person, although free from all *guilt* (Rom. 8, 1), still has within him a sinful *nature*; and the Scriptures confirm it (1 John 1, 8. 9; Rom. 7, 23; Gal. 5, 17).

Remark: 1. The Romish Church confounds the *end* with the *means*. The end is indeed essential righteousness and holiness; but justification is only the means for attaining this; for in it we receive joyfulness and strength for sanctification, that we may now strive after it.

Remark: 2. Since the Romish Church does not regard justification as a judicial act of God complete in itself, but connects it with sanctification consequent to it, no one can, according to Romish ideas, ever be fully certain of his state of grace. The Protestant Church, on the contrary, says to her believing members: "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 6, 17), and they themselves say: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8, 16).

Luther, in his sermon on Rom. 8, 34: *Quis accusabit?* (Who is he that will accuse?), speaks very clearly and beautifully about the judicial act of God in justifying the sinner. He says, "Here we must speak after the manner of a judicial trial. There is the judge, the accused, the jailer, the execu-

tioner, etc. Just so it is in our conscience. When I have sinned the beadle comes, my heart pronounces judgment upon me, conscience says *yea*, cites me before the court, and shows me the strict Judge, God. If He looks angry my heart melts within me. On the other side stands death and says to the Judge, the sinner is mine. The devil with the spear in hand is about to take away the sinner. * * * I grow despondent and say, now I am lost forever. This is hell and everlasting despair.—Now, if it were not for this text the sinner must indeed be lost forever. But here is comfort; they shall indeed be accused as wicked, but God justifies us, *i. e.* He takes our part. It is true we have well deserved death, but God defends us through His Son, who pleads our cause before God the Father as an Advocate, and intercedes for the poor sinner: Father, the sinner is a mute, he cannot speak; I have rendered *satisfaction* for him, spare him. Then Christ graciously bends low, shoulders the poor sinner and thus delivers him from death and his jailer or his tormentor. — God acts as a father towards his son; if any one should say, behold thy son squinteth, the father says he casteth eyes of love. Again: The mole becomes him so well! So also Christ does: Oh it is not sin, it is only weakness in the poor sinner. — *Quis condemnabit?* (Who will condemn?) The first thing is to accuse, the second to condemn. In the first place judgment is pronounced upon the sinner, but the Son intercedes for us. In the second place: If God is our Friend the decision is in our favor and says: Be off you policeman, you have lost your case against the sinner, the sinner has won, begone! — Finally it must be borne in mind that no one should expect to become rid of all sin, evil lust and wicked thoughts. Let each one see to it that he have within himself an earnest longing, and sigh to God: Oh how I would like to be rid of sin. This cry *Spiritus Sancti* (of the Holy Spirit) goes with us till the last day, hence there is always sin in poor Christians. They sin, but not through malice and purposely, but in weakness; these God willingly pardons. Therefore our best comfort is this,

that we have in us the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*, namely: Whoever is in need can have within him a longing after God, who will be gracious to him and help him."

VII. In the Article Concerning Grace.

1. Man can fit himself (only by the aid of the Holy Spirit, it is true, but yet) through his own moral power for the acceptance of justifying grace, and thus "to a certain extent merit" the same.

Against this observe: "We are not sufficient of ourselves," 2 Cor. 3, 5; compare 1 Cor. 2, 14; much less are we able to will¹ or to do it (John 15, 5); all this we must let God work in us (Phil. 2, 13). Thus, then, we are justified by His grace, without merit (Rom. 3, 24). "Where is boasting then" (as if we could "to a certain extent merit" it)? "It is excluded." Rom. 3, 27.

2. But, as justifying grace is infused into man, he receives the power to keep all God's command-

¹True, in Rom. 7, 18 Paul says: "To will is present with me"; but you must remember that Paul here no more speaks of his former natural condition (as in verses 8-13, where he speaks altogether of the past), but of his present condition, after he was justified, and had, in justification, received the power of the Holy Ghost. To will that which was good did not, therefore, proceed from his flesh, i. e. his natural power, for in it "dwelt no good thing," but from the power of the Holy Ghost which had been given him; the natural power, on the contrary, opposed it, that, if possible, it might not be done. This warring between the old natural and new spiritual powers is described in Gal. 5, 17 in a similar manner as here in verse 19.

ments, and through good works directly to merit eternal salvation.

Against this observe: True, the justified man can and must indeed work out his own salvation (Phil. 2, 12); but this is not done of our own natural power — “it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do” (v. 13). As He personally takes up His abode in our hearts and as we apprehend Him more and more, the moral power increases in us through His operation and communion with us, and from such fulness in Christ Jesus we receive grace for grace, *i. e.* grace and ever new grace (John 1, 16). Now since, even after justification, we may never reject grace, as being superfluous (Gal. 2, 21), we are not only justified but also saved by grace (Eph. 2, 8; Acts 15, 11); “but if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace” (Rom. 11, 6).

“We are regenerated through it (faith); and through it is received into our hearts the Holy Ghost, who renews our hearts, so that we are enabled to keep the law of God, to fear and love Him truly, and not to waver or doubt that Christ was given for us, and that He hears our cries and prayers, so that we can commend ourselves joyfully to God’s will, even in the midst of death.” (Apol. Art. IV.) But —

“There is no one that fears and loves God with his whole heart, as he is under obligation to do; no one that bears crosses and afflictions in entire submission to God; no one that does not often doubt, through weakness, whether God accepts him also, whether He regards him, whether He hears his prayers. * * * Therefore Augustine asserts that: ‘We keep all the commandments of God, when all is forgiven us that we do not keep.’” (Apol. Art. VI. Jacobs’ ed. pp. 91. 112).

Remark: The Scripture indeed speaks here and there of a heavenly reward; but this evidently has different degrees (Dan. 12, 3; Matt. 10, 40-41), and can therefore have no reference to salvation in general, which shall be the portion of all

believers without exception (Acts 15, 11), but only to that particular glory which shall be bestowed upon the individual saints in different degrees. But it should also be remarked that this special reward of glory is also purely a reward of grace, for when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, i. e. have merited nothing (Luke 17, 10); God, however, has in store for each faithful servant a reward of free grace, not *for the sake of*, but *according to the measure of* his works, which show forth the faith concealed in his heart (James 2, 18), and thus serve as the measure of the purposed reward of grace.

"There are two kinds of compensation — one which a man is under obligation to make, another which he is not under obligation to make; as, if the emperor gives to his servant a principality, by it the servant's labor is recompensed; and yet the labor is not deserving the principality, but the servant acknowledges that it is a gratuitous reward: so God does not owe to us eternal life for our works; however, as He grants it for Christ's sake to believers, their afflictions and works, by it, are recompensed. We say, moreover, that good works are truly deserving and meritorious, not that they should merit for us the remission of sins or eternal life; but they are meritorious with respect to other gifts, which are given in this life and the life to come. For God withholds or procrastinates many gifts till yonder life, where, after this life, He will raise the saints to honor. For the blessed will have compensation, one higher than another." (Apol. Art. VI. Jacobs' ed. p. 154).

3. Nay, he can even perform works of supererogation, by doing not only that which God expressly commands, but also that which God has indeed advised, but nevertheless left optional. (The so-called "Evangelical decrees," of which the most important are the three monastic vows: unconditional obedience, total poverty, and life-long chastity.) Connected with this is their conception of an *ideal moral life*.

The monk and the nun, who have renounced the world with its gifts and tasks, lead a morally perfect life. Cloister life is the highest degree of moral life.

Against this observe: 1. No man, not even the most holy, can fulfill even the express commands of God; for, "if we say," says John in his 1st Epistle, 1. 8, in the most general way, including himself also (who was surely as holy as any), "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (Compare also 2, 1.) 2. God requires of us in His commandments that we love Him with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourself; above this sum and substance of the law we cannot imagine any thing higher which God could counsel or advise the perfect to do.¹ But, as to the advice to give up our natural calling

¹The advice concerning celibacy, for instance, 1 Cor. 7, 1, the Apostle evidently gives only with regard to the then prevailing circumstances (v. 26); nor was its object the increase of holiness, but only the decrease of bodily tribulation (v. 28), which in the approaching persecution would oppress the married in a twofold and threefold manner. But as regards Matt. 19, 21, upon which the Romish Church bases her Evangelical decree of "total poverty" for those who strive after perfect holiness, the Lord, in demanding of the youth to sell everything that he had and give to the poor, if he wished to be perfect, evidently intended no more than this: He wished to convince him, by a given example, that he yet lacked much of having fulfilled the ten commandments, which he thought he had kept (v. 20). For it now became evident that he did not love God and divine things above mammon, above all things else, and that thus he was still a debtor to the whole law; else he would certainly have followed the Lord, as the One who spake of nothing but God and divine things, and, who according to the youth's own confession, could show the way to eternal life (v. 16).

in favor of life in a cloister, the Scriptures nowhere demand or even advise this. Paul, on the other hand, with respect to the different relations of natural life, gives the Corinthians this rule: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called" (1 Cor. 7, 20. 17. 18. 21). And he warns against those who walk "in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." Col. 2, 18. 23.

"Moreover, they would persuade men that these invented religious orders are a state of Christian perfection. * * * Righteousness of faith, which ought especially to be taught in the Church, is obscured, when this marvellous worshipping of angels, the pretense of poverty, and humility, and celibacy, are set up before men's eyes.

"Christian perfection is this, to fear God with sincerity of heart, and also to heartily believe and trust that we have for Christ's sake a gracious, merciful God, and that we may and should ask and desire of and certainly look to God for whatsoever we need, according to our calling; and outwardly to do good works diligently, and to attend to our vocation." (Jacobs' ed. p. 60).

"God has commanded sincere prayer, real alms and fasts; and inasmuch as they have been ordered by Him, no one can omit them with impunity. But works, in so far as they are not commanded in the divine law, but have been framed according to human caprice (Col. 2, 20-23), are nothing but ordinances of men, in reference to which Christ says: 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Matt. 15, 9." (Apol. Chap. VI. Jacobs' ed. p. 205.)

VIII. In the Article Concerning Repentance — (Confession and Absolution).

1. To repentance there belong essentially three things: 1. contrition of the heart (or repentance with the resolution of amendment); 2. confession of the mouth (with the enumeration, by name, of each and

every sin); and 3. satisfaction by works (*satisfactio*, especially prayer, fasting, alms).

Against this observe: The third part conflicts with the exclusive merit of Christ, and is, besides this, a matter of impossibility for man, whose duty it is to fear, love and trust in God above all things every moment, thus leaving him no time to make up for neglected duties; and who also every day adds new guilt to the old, and must pray: "Forgive us our trespasses." The second part, however, is an exaggeration, in so far as a nominal enumeration of all sins is required; for, "who can understand his errors?" (Ps. 19, 12) — and our Church teaches that "consciences are not to be burdened with the enumerating of all sins." The first part, finally, repentance (*Reue*), is vitiated by the Romish Church, in that she does not distinguish between a true and a false, but between an insufficient and a perfect repentance, whilst all our repentance is and must remain very imperfect, and in it God looks solely and alone upon our sincerity (1 Chron. 30, 17).

On the contrary, there is lacking an essential part, viz. that confidence of faith that our sins are to be forgiven only for the sake of Christ (without which confidence the first part, repentance, avails nothing, Matt. 27, 3. 5). It is wanting; for that faith which the Romish Church always presupposes, is only the assent of the understanding and no heartfelt confidence (see V.); but if they nevertheless speak of a confidence in divine mercy, which must be connected with repentance, they mean such confidence in divine mercy, that mercy will be gracious to the penitent sinner on account of his repentance, thus making repentance meritorious. "They teach us to be confident that we obtain remission of sins because of contrition and love. What else is this than to put confidence in our works?" (Apol. Jacobs' ed., p. 191.)

That the Scriptures themselves consider sorrow for sin and faith as parts of repentance is according to the Apology implied in Matt. 11, 28: "Come unto me, all ye that labor

and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' Here there are two members. The 'labor' and the 'burden' signify the contrition, anxiety and terrors of sin and death. 'To come to Christ' is to believe that sins are remitted for Christ's sake; when we believe our hearts are quickened by the Holy Ghost through the Word of Christ. Here, therefore, there are these two chief parts, contrition and faith. And in Mark 1, 15, Christ says: 'Repent ye and believe the Gospel.' As in the first member, He convicts of sins, in the latter He consoles us, and shows the remission of sins." (Apol. Jacobs' ed., p. 183).

Remark: The Romish Church regards penitence as the second saving plank in the shipwreck of sin, as if God did also, on His part, violate the baptismal covenant, after man, on his part, has broken it (contrary to Rom. 3, 3; 2 Tim. 2, 13).

"Repentance, therefore, is nothing else than a return and approach to baptism, that we return to and practice what had been begun and had been abandoned.—The ship never breaks, because (as we have said) it is the institution of God, and not a matter of ours; but it happens, indeed, that we slip and fall out of the ship. Yet if any one fall out, let him see to it that he swim up and cling to it till he again come into it and live in it, as he had formerly begun." (Apol. Jacobs' ed., p. 475.)

2. But the Church may absolve the penitent from satisfaction by works; for she has an inexhaustible supply of the superfluous merit of Christ and the saints, who have done more of good than they have personal need of, from which supply she may impart "indulgence" at pleasure. In the same way she can, by indulgences, deliver from purgatory those who were sent there because they failed to render satisfaction here on earth.

Against this observe: The Church can neither impose satisfaction, since it is contrary to Scripture and a matter of impossibility for man, nor can she release it in view of her treasure of superfluous merit;— and this for the simple reason that this treasure is a mere phantom of the brain, contrary to God's Word (VII, 1, VII, 3). This whole offensive doctrine of indulgences is without any foundation whatever, and falls to the ground of itself. Besides, it must here be remarked that the popular practice is far worse than the theory. According to the theory indulgence does not effect the forgiveness of sins, but only effects a release from the external penalties imposed by the Church, or a release from the sufferings of purgatory. But, practically, the matter assumes far worse forms. What shall we say to it, when such remission (indulgence) is made to depend on the visiting of certain places, the repeated "saying" of certain prayers, the observance of certain festivals, nay even on the wearing of such things as scapularies and medals! To this must be added yet that the public announcements of indulgences, under the present pope too, speak of "perfect release from all sins" and "perfect indulgence and *forgiveness of all sins.*" Thus, by taking part in the celebration of a certain festival, or by visiting a certain church, one could receive forgiveness of sins! How easy, especially for the uneducated Christian, in connection with such announcements, to think that indulgence is all-sufficient, and that there is no further need of confession and contrition.

IX. In the Article Concerning the Sacrament.

1. Bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are substantially changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, by the consecration or blessing of the priest (as by magic); so that nothing remains of them, except the original form, color, smell and taste. (Thus a second miracle!)

Against this observe: 1. It is not said, "This *has become* my body"; nay, even if it were, it would not necessarily follow therefrom that the bread is entirely changed into the body, for so it is also written that the Word, *i. e.* the second person in the Trinity, became flesh or man; and yet we are not to understand that Divinity was changed into or absorbed by humanity. 2. But if the words in question *must* not be understood thus, why put this construction upon them, in spite of the evidence of our five senses? 3. Finally, the Apostle, who assures us that he received it from the Lord (1 Cor. 11, 23), gives us a very plain indication that we are not thus to understand the above expression, by repeatedly, in the most unqualified manner, calling the consecrated or blessed element bread, after as well as before the consecration (1 Cor. 10, 16; 11, 27-28), whilst, according to the Romish idea, there remains nothing of the bread except the mere appearance.

But as regards the consecration of the elements, herein the priest does nothing, but Christ, through the words of the institution, does all.

"For where His institution is observed and His words concerning the bread and cup (wine) are spoken, and the consecrated bread and cup (wine) are distributed, Christ Himself, through the spoken words, is still efficacious *by virtue of the first institution*, through His Word which He wishes to be there repeated. As Chrysostom says in his sermon concerning the passion: 'Christ Himself prepares this table and blesses it; for no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but, by God's power and grace, the elements presented are consecrated in the Supper by the Word, where he speaks: 'This is My body.' And just as the declaration (Gen. 1, 28): 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was spoken only once, but is ever efficacious in nature, so that it is fruitful and multiplies; so also this declaration (This is My body; this is My blood)

was once spoken, but, even to this day and to His advent it is efficacious, and works so that in the Supper of the churches His true body and blood are present." (Form. Conc. Jacob's ed., p. 615.)

2. The consecrated element remains a true sacrament even after the sacramental act, whether it is used or not; wherefore it may be kept and, as occasion requires, be carried to the sick.

Against this observe: The Lord, on His part, *gave* the bread, the disciples, on their part, *took* and ate it. The consecrated element was thus handled and used. To this we still adhere, and are certain that the consecrated element is a true sacrament whilst we handle and use it according to the command of Christ. But we have no surety that it is and remains a sacrament, apart from the sacramental act. "For nothing can be a sacrament without God's command and ordained *use*."

3. The consecrated wafer may and shall be worshipped by believers.

Against this observe: When you receive the blessed bread you may bend your knees before the Lord, who is present in the sacrament; before the wafer, never! If indeed the Romish Church could prove that the bread is essentially changed into the body of the Lord, then there could be no objection to this; for then the wafer would be nothing else than the body of Him in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and at whose name every knee shall bow (Phil. 2, 10). But as she cannot do this, she does wrong when she presents the consecrated wafer, which is only to be eaten, to believers for adoration, and when she carries it about with great pomp on Corpus Christi day; for the Lord says expressly: "Take and eat" and not, carry it about and adore it.

Remark: In this connection the reader will remember that some years ago the Protestant soldiers in Bavaria were expected to take part in bending the knee before the consecrated wafer.

4. It is a damnable error to mention the forgiveness of sins as the chief result — or benefit — of partaking of the holy Lord's Supper. Its participation works deliverance from daily sins and preservation from mortal sins.

Against this observe: The chief object of the holy Lord's Supper is to appropriate to us (Matt. 26, 28) the work of Christ, above all, the forgiveness of sins. Thus it must bring to us the greatest of all gifts, viz. the forgiveness of sins, and that in such a manner that we are specially assured of forgiveness when we partake of this holy sacrament. Then we must remember that the Apostle admonishes to earnest self-examination before the reception of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11, 28); but the result of such examination will always be the knowledge of our sins. The Lord's Supper, then, brings the forgiveness of these. The Catholic view differs from this, because they, as in general, so also in the Lord's Supper, regard grace as a power infused into man, by means of which he is enabled to do that which is good. Thus then the Lord's Supper is to preserve from mortal sins.

5. Since the blood may not be separated from the body, and thus whoever receives the body at the same time receives the blood, the Lord's Supper under one form is sufficient for salvation. (In this way the Romish Church seeks to justify the withholding of the cup from the laity.)

Against this observe: The question here is not at all whether *we* regard it as sufficient; the Lord evidently re-

garded it as necessary, else He would not have instituted it under both forms, and said directly with regard to the cup, "Drink ye *all* of it." It is evident also from 1 Cor. 11, 23 sq., that the Lord wanted His Supper celebrated in all time to come in the same way as He instituted it in the night in which He was betrayed, *i. e.* under both forms, until He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead (v. 26); and in the whole chapter not the slightest distinction is made between priests and laity, but it is said in a general way: "As often as ye (priests or lay members) eat this bread, and drink this cup," and "whoever (priest or lay member) shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily" (compare also v. 29); from which it follows that a mutilation of the sacrament to the disadvantage of the laity cannot at all be justified by the Holy Scriptures. Just as little can it be justified by that argument of reason "that the blood is received at the same time with the body"; for in no case should we want to know or do anything better than our Lord and Master, least of all in a testamentary matter, such as the Lord's Supper also is. Besides, the Romish Church cannot deny that the withholding of the cup from the laity began only in the 12th century,¹ and that too against the most decided opposition of highly respected teachers, nay, even of popes (Leo and Gelasius in the 5th century), who

¹In Acts 2, 42, the breaking of bread alone is mentioned; but this does not prove that at that time already the cup was occasionally withheld; for silence in itself is no evidence, and the circumstance that no mention is here made of the cup is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the object here is not doctrinal instruction, but only a historical report, which may and should be brief, and where a part may be taken for the whole. (Similar to this is Acts 19, ¹5, from which it does not follow that baptism was administered only in the name of Jesus Christ, and not also in the name of God the Father and the Holy Ghost.) Surely the Apostle Paul, who so emphatically speaks to the Corinthians of the

forbade this mutilation of the sacrament as a "great robbery of the Church."

6. In the Holy Supper the Lord is ever offered up anew in an unbloody manner for the forgiveness of sins, by the hands of the priest (sacrifice of the mass).

Against this observe: 1. In the New Testament there are, properly speaking, no sacrifices; here only offerings of praise and love are acceptable (Heb. 13, 15-16). 2. An unbloody sacrifice, however, for the forgiveness of sins is, according to the Scripture, an absurdity; for without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin (Heb. 9, 12). 3. Christ offered Himself *once for all* (Heb. 9, 28), and with one sacrifice made perfect forever all who are sanctified. The Romish Church, therefore, with her ever-recurring sacrifice of the mass, detracts from the ever perfect merit of Christ, and evidently falls back into the Old Testament, where every year the same sacrifices had to be brought anew, and yet could not make perfect those who came thereunto (Heb. 10, 1).

7. Besides Baptism and the Lord's Supper there are five other sacraments: *Confirmation*, *Repentance* (Confession and Absolution), *Ordination of priests*, *Matrimony* and *Extreme Unction*.

Against this observe: If we take the word "sacrament" in its wider sense of "holy act," we may also accept these five; but then there would be many other sacraments, as prayer, the preaching of the Word, etc. But the Romish

Lord's Supper under both forms, would not have tolerated the creeping in of this mutilation of the sacrament, and yet in Acts 20, 7, where he also takes part, the bread only is mentioned.

Church wants these to be regarded as sacraments in exactly the same sense as Baptism and the Lord's Supper; nay, even regards Confirmation of greater importance than Baptism; this is false and contrary to Scripture.

To a sacrament, in the sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are such, three things are requisite: 1. A divine command; 2. an earthly element; 3. a heavenly gift.

Now in *Confirmation* (in which, according to the Romish doctrine, adult Christians receive certain gracious gifts for spiritual knighthood, whilst the bishop anoints them with consecrated oil) all these three requisites are wanting; for the laying on of hands, connected with prayer, by the Apostles, on those who were already baptized (Acts 8, 15. 17), was not connected with any anointing, and moreover had for its object, not the imparting of ordinary gifts of grace, but of extraordinary miraculous powers, and cannot therefore be compared with Confirmation, either in form or substance.

Again, in *Repentance* (Confession and Absolution) there is wanting the second requisite, namely the earthly sign or element; for the laying on of hands usually connected with it is only a significant gesture, without express divine command; nay, even without a well established apostolic example.

In the *Ordination* of priests the three requisites again are lacking. It is nothing more than a very salutary churchly usage, come down to us from the time of the Apostles, which should by all means be retained. But there is for it no express divine command, and the laying on of hands connected with it, which was also used in setting apart almoners (Acts 6, 6), and in many other holy acts, is again only a significant gesture according to apostolic example (2 Tim. 1, 6). As regards the gifts to be imparted, we do not know what the *Apostles'* prayers and laying on of hands availed — perhaps the Apostles could impart to those who received an office particular gifts qualifying them for that office (2 Tim. 1, 6, and 1 Tim. 4, 14), even as they could impart to any Christian extraordinary miraculous power (Acts 8, 14-20, and 19,

6). But as regards us, we have no warrant that our prayer and laying on of hands will effect more than a believing prayer, if it be fervent, will avail at any time (James 5, 16).

As to the solemnization of *Matrimony*, here the three requisites are also wanting. Although matrimony itself is a holy ordinance,¹ instituted by God Himself, and having many promises of blessings for this life,² it is yet not a New Testament ordinance, and can therefore not come under consideration in this connection.

Remark: The Romish Church, in accordance with her view of marriage as a sacrament, does not even in the case of adultery permit a divorce in the proper sense, so that the innocent party might be permitted to marry again. This is evidently contrary to Matt. 19, 9, where the Lord Himself allows the exception to the rule set forth in verse 6, in case of adultery.

Of *Extreme Unction*, finally, as a preparation of the dying for a happy end, we find not one word in Scripture. The anointing mentioned in James 5, 14, where the stress is, however, laid upon the believing prayer connected therewith (v. 15), did not take place as a preparation of the dying for a happy end, but for the restoration of the sick (vs. 15-16,

¹ The passage (Eph. 5, 32) proves nothing as to the real character of matrimony. For the *Vulgata* (see I., 2) has rendered the original Greek word, which signifies a holy mystery, by *sacramentum*, in the same sense. But the meaning of the Apostle is: The mysterious signification of matrimony is great. Why? Because it symbolizes the intimate union of Christ with the Church, who is not only one Spirit, but also one body with her, inasmuch as He gives her not only His Spirit in the Word, but also His flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar.

² In 1 Tim. 2, 15, the stress must be placed upon "if she continue in faith," etc.; and no more is said than that her calling as wife shall not prevent her salvation.

“and the prayer of faith shall save the sick”, compare also Mark 6, 13), in order that they might be “healed” again.

X. In the Article Concerning the Last Things.

There is a place intermediate between heaven and hell, called Purgatory, where souls, before they may enter heaven, must render satisfaction for all venial as well as for those mortal sins which they did not expiate while upon earth. In this however they are helped by the intercessions of the faithful, and especially by the sacrifice of the mass.

Against this observe: Satisfaction on the part of man is not, according to the Scripture, even to be thought of here on earth (VIII, 1), where at least, some reparation may be made for the injury done by sin; much less beyond this life; for, while in Matt. 5, 26, it is said that the impenitent sinner shall be condemned until he has paid the uttermost farthing, it is not said in connection therewith that he ever can pay it; we must rather infer the contrary from the entire context of Scripture (Rom. 3, 28; Gal. 2, 16). Not only the object assigned to purgatory, however, must fall to the ground, but purgatory itself is a pure invention of men. The Scripture passage which seems most to favor this doctrine, and which is most appealed to by the Romish Church, is 1 Cor. 3, 14-15. But in this passage the Apostle does not speak of a real fire, else the gold, silver, wood and hay (v. 12) must also be real gold, silver, wood and hay; but of a figurative fire; and the Apostle plainly indicates by the expression “as,” *i. e.* in like manner as through fire (v. 15), that he here speaks in a parable. Besides, this figurative fire here spoken of is not a purgatory (purifying) fire, but much rather a fire of test or trial. What, then, becomes of purgatory? — since there is nothing said here either of a real fire, or of a purging or purifying.

But if, finally, the Romish Church refers to 2 Maccabees 12, 42-46, to prove the benefit of intercession, and especially of the sacrifice of the mass for the departed, it must be remembered that: 1. The example of even the holiest men in Scripture is not in itself binding, especially in the Old Testament where many things were observed which are abolished in the New (Heb. 10, 9). 2. Judas Maccabee, as can be shown, went even beyond the Old Testament, in this that he brought a sin offering for the dead, for which there was in the Old Testament neither command nor promise. 3. The author also characterizes the undertaking of Judas Maccabee as a "holy and good thought" (without definite Scriptural ground). 4. The whole passage is apocryphal.

XI. In the Article Concerning the Church.

✓ 1. To the true unity of the Church there belongs not only unity in doctrine, but also uniformity in organization and usages.

Against this observe: The Apostles always exhort only to unity in word, *i. e.* in faith, doctrine and confession (1 Cor. 1, 10; Phil. 3, 15; Gal. 1, 7-8; Eph. 4, 13-14; 1 Tim. 6, 3; 2 Tim. 1, 13); but in regard to external usages and organization they only give the general rule: "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. 14, 40), since God is a God of order (14, 33); as they also occasionally urge the imitation of this or that salutary and well-tried usage (1 Cor. 11, 2-16). But from this it does not follow that perfect uniformity in organization and usages is every where possible, desirable or even necessary to the unity of the Church; and, strictly speaking, the Romish Church cannot, in reality, boast of such uniformity.

2. This one Church (*i. e.* the Romish) can not err, since she is governed by the Holy Ghost; she, especially her head, the pope, is infallible.

Against this observe: That church which suffers herself to be governed by the Holy Spirit does not err (John 16, 13); she is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. 3, 15). But that the Romish Church often has erred,¹ is very evident from her frequent contradictions, and from her manifest departure from the Word of God. From which we conclude that in these things she has *not* suffered herself to be governed by the Holy Ghost.

Remark: The Romish Church herself did not decide until very recently, whether infallibility belongs to the pope or to the general council of bishops. The Vatican Council (1870) decided the matter in favor of the pope (see further on).

3. Outside of this one true Church (*i. e.* the Romish) there is no salvation.

Against this observe: Outside of the *Christian* Church there is indeed no salvation; for in her possession alone the means of grace, the divine Word and the sacraments, are to be found. Now let us for a moment suppose, which however, is not the case, that the Romish Church possess the Christian doctrine pure and unadulterated in all its parts, whilst all other churches have only fragments of the same. Then the Romish Church could indeed claim to be the only true and unadulterated, but still not the only saving church; but would first have to prove that no other church communion has sufficient fragments of Christian doctrine for salvation. Or *can* no one be saved in a partly corrupted church communion, where, upon the true Scriptural foundation of Christ's person, work and office (1 Cor. 3, 11), the stubble of human wisdom is built up, which in the day of separation shall be burnt as useless? (v. 13). That it *is barely possible* is proved by 1 Cor. 3, 15, where it is said that even he who

¹For instance, three Church councils and more than that many popes have condemned pope Honorius I. (d. 638) as a heretic. Where then is infallibility?

builds such doctrinal stubble upon the true Scriptural ground may possibly be saved, "yet so as by fire," *i. e.* as one who has been rescued, with difficulty, from the already burning fire (Jude, v. 23).

4. The ministers of the Word are priests in the true sense of the word (with reference especially to the unbloody sacrifice which, in the mass, they must offer for the people). They alone can administer the sacraments. Now, since grace is infused through the sacraments, every Christian needs the priests.

Against this observe: Properly speaking, all sacrifices have ceased in the New Testament (Heb. 10, 9); here only sacrifices of praise and love are acceptable (Heb. 13, 15-16). But where there are no real sacrifices, there of course there are no real priests. But as regards the administration of the sacraments, this belongs to the clergy only for the sake of order; not as though they alone could "make" the sacraments. But the Romish view, that priests are lords over the congregation, and that obedience to them is a religious duty, rests largely upon this idea.

5. They (the priests) are therefore to be regarded as an order wholly and essentially different from the laity.

Against this observe: All Christians are spiritual priests (1 Pet. 2, 9), and therefore have *equal rights* before God; but not all have *the same office and calling* in the congregation (Eph. 4, 11-21). For the better edification of the Church God has instituted the office of teaching, and has charged her with the duty of calling men to this office. Those therefore who are called by the Church have no right to claim that they are an order wholly and essentially different from all other Christians and to set themselves up as lords over the congregation (against this see 1 Pet. 5, 3).

Remark: The celibacy of the priests, introduced in the face of the strongest opposition (and evidently contrary to 1 Tim. 4, 3; 1 Cor. 9, 5; 1 Tim. 3, 2-11, and Tit. 1, 6, in which last two passages bishops, like every other sincere Christian, are only forbidden to practice polygamy), is also intended (among other things) still further to separate the priests from the laity, and to surround the former with a kind of moral halo; whilst the state of matrimony, "viewed according to God's Word, by which it is adorned and sanctified, is not only to be regarded as highly as all other states or orders, but also higher than and above all, whether emperors, princes, bishops, or whatever they may be."—"Now as human commands and laws cannot so effect a change, that the earth should become unproductive, after God has said: 'Let the earth bring forth grass,' etc., so also no monastic vow, or human command, can so change human nature, that there should not be mutual affection between the sexes, without a special operation or gift of God (1 Cor. 7, 7), which we cannot secure through our prayers, but which God divides as He will (1 Cor. 12, 11)." (Apol. Art. XXIII. Jacobs' ed., p. 248.)

6. Neither can they return again to the order of the laity, since through their ordination an indelible character is impressed upon them.

Against this observe: Ordination is *really* nothing more than a wholesome Church usage from the days of the Apostles, in order, after due examination, to confirm the vocation (or call) in a solemn manner, and to invoke upon him who is called the blessing of God. Now, if the chief thing, the call, may be destroyed or revoked, why not also the ordination?

7. The ministers of the Word are spiritual "*judges*," who pass judgment, in God's stead, upon the sins which must be separately enumerated to

them (VIII, 1), forgive or retain them, and impose penances.

Against this observe: True, the Christian Church has the right to forgive and to retain sins (Matt. 18, 18) in God's stead; of course, according to the rule established in the divine Word, and in doubtful cases conditionally. It is the office of the properly called minister of the Word to exercise this right; but in this he is no judge to examine and impose punishments upon those confessing, but a "helper of their joy" (2 Cor. 1, 24).

8. Among the ministers of the Word themselves there is a difference in degree, from the common priest (presbyter) up to the bishop, to whom alone, as the successor of the Apostles, belongs the right to perform the ceremonies of confirmation and ordination.

Against this observe: In a certain sense no minister whatever is a successor of the Apostles; for to the office of an apostle there belong two things: one, to have been an eye and an ear witness of the Lord Jesus from the beginning (Acts 1, 21-22; compared with John 15, 27);¹ the other, to have been immediately called thereto of the Lord (Gal. 1, 1; compared with Acts 1, 24); and connected with these there was, thirdly, a perfect infallibility in things pertaining to the saving doctrine; for they were not to testify alone, but together with the Holy Ghost (John 15, 26-27), who was to call all things to their remembrance (John 14, 26), and, in general, lead them into all truth (John 16, 13). Neither priest nor bishop can claim that he was an eye witness, that

¹The Lord had revealed Himself to the Apostle Paul in a supernatural manner (2 Cor. 12, 1), so that he could say: "I have received from the Lord" (1 Cor. 11, 23; Gal. 1, 12), and was therefore as good as an eye witness.

he was immediately called, or that he is infallible; and therefore not even one minister of the Word is, in the full sense of the term, a successor of the Apostles. * * * But in a certain other sense all ministers of the Word, without exception (and not only bishops), are successors of the Apostles; for they all have the same pastoral office, and lack only the perfect authority and power of the Apostles. A difference of degree can therefore exist among them only by human, but not by divine, right. For originally, they are all commissioned to perform the same duties, those viz. belonging to the pastoral office (preaching, confession, administration of the sacraments, and ordination). Thus, doubtless, it was in the Apostolic Church; for the presbyters (rendered "elders" in the English version) at first differed in no respect from the bishops. This is evident from Acts 20, where the same persons who, in verse 17, were called elders, are called bishops in verse 28; so also in Titus 1, 5, compared with verse 7.

9. Exalted above them all, finally, stands the Romish pope, who, as the successor of Peter, the highest Apostle, is the visible head of the Church and Christ's vicar on earth. His utterances and decisions in matters of faith and morals are *infallible*.

Against this observe: The vicar of Christ on earth is the Holy Ghost (John 14, 16); and He alone can be, as He is of equal power and honor with the Lord.

But it is by no means certain that a *visible* head of the Church, even according to human right, *i. e.* for the sake of human order, is at all desirable, in view of the magnitude of the thing itself and the great infirmity of man.

That the pope calls himself the successor of Peter is arbitrary, though there is some evidence that Peter was at least in Rome, for Peter was also at other places. But even if the pope were the successor of Peter, it would by no means follow, as a necessary consequence, that with the pastoral

office, the pope had also received the Apostolic authority of Peter; for this, as we have seen (8), was not transmissible, but adhered to and died with the person. * * * But if the Romish Church calls Peter the highest Apostle, and besides the general, ascribes to him an especial authority by virtue of which he rose above all the other Apostles, this pre-eminence, belonging exclusively to his person, would still have been much less transmissible than the general Apostolic authority. But (and this at once puts and end to the papal usurpation founded upon this especial authority) an official pre-eminence of Peter above the other Apostles cannot even be proved from the Holy Scriptures. The Romish Church refers to Matt. 16, 18, as an indisputable evidence therefor. But the Lord could build His Church upon Peter, even without granting him an official preference, in so far as Peter had first of all so clearly and decidedly confessed himself to the ground upon which the Christian Church should be built, *i. e.* to the faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God (1 Cor. 3, 11), and as he also, on account of this decided confession, as well as on account of his general active character, was really the one through whose instrumentality especially the Lord gathered the first congregation on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2, 14). Then we must not fail to note that our Lord here addresses Himself not to Peter alone, but to *all* the disciples (v. 15); Peter, with his rash temperament, answers first in the name of all; that the others, however, had the same faith, is evident from verse 20. We can therefore not at all perceive how the words (Matt. 16, 18) can indicate an official preference of Peter above the other Apostles, since he is here referred to only as one among them. But that afterwards, in the meetings of the Apostles, Peter generally stands first (Acts 2, 14; 3, 4-12; 4, 8; 5, 3; 5, 29; 8, 20), is to be ascribed to the same cause that moved him formerly always to speak in the name of all (as here also, Matt. 16, 15-16, and then 22, and John 6, 68), to the same cause for which he first entered the grave of Jesus (John 20, 5-8), to the same cause that moved him

once to walk towards Christ on the sea, and another time to swim towards Him, viz. to his ardent, courageous, decided character, which of itself (even without a formal superiority) quite naturally and necessarily, both before and afterwards, made him the spokesman for all.

As the successor of the Apostles and vicar of Christ, the pope of late claims for himself infallibility. This dogma, promulgated to the Catholic Church in 1870, reads: "We teach and declare, as a divinely revealed dogma, that the Romish pope, when he speaks from his chair (*ex cathedra*), i. e. when he officiates as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, and in accordance with his supreme apostolic authority lays down a doctrine of faith or morals to be observed by the whole Church, by virtue of the divine aid promised him in Peter — has the fulness of infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished His Church to be equipped in the setting forth of a doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore such statements of the pope, are in themselves and not because the Church agrees to them, unalterable. But if any one should dare to contradict these, our sentences, which may God prevent, let him be accursed!"

Against this doctrine observe: 1. The popes are not infallible, first of all, because their doctrines in so many instances, as we have already seen, and see especially in this last dogma, are not in harmony with the Scriptures. Hence they are fallible. 2. In the second place, history shows clearly that the popes are erring men. Of Honorius we have already spoken (see XI, 2, *Remark*); and, which of them was infallible, Clement XIV., who set aside the order of Jesuits as being no longer of any use, or Pius VII., who reinstated it? And those who know the weakness and vacillations which characterized Pius VII. in his relation to Napoleon I., or who will recall the changes of views of Pius IX., will not be able to reconcile them with infallibility. 3. It is foolish to cite Luke 22, 32, where Christ says to Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," as a proof for infallibility. For there our Lord simply wants to tell

Peter that He has prayed for him, to the end that he, notwithstanding that he would so soon deny Him, should not lose his faith, but repent and strengthen his brethren. What has this word, spoken to Peter under such peculiar circumstances, to do with the infallibility of the pope?

Finally it must be remarked that the popes not only exercise authority over the Church, but also claim the right to dominate over the governments of the world. Since the spiritual is above the temporal, they say that princes and states should render obedience to the pope. As Pope Boniface VIII. said in the year 1302: Every human being must, for the sake of his salvation, submit to the pope, so Pius IX., in the year 1873, wrote to the Emperor William that even the emperor, in common with all baptized persons, "belongs" to him, the pope. Consistently with this view the pope and bishops are continually meddling in worldly affairs with which the kingdom of Christ has nothing to do. In what glaring contradiction is this to the conduct of our Lord, whose vicars the popes claim to be (see John 18, 36; Matt. 20, 25-26; Luke 12, 14), and how hard to reconcile it with the admonition of Peter, who they claim was the first pope, to the elders—whose fellow elder, by the way, he claims to be—: "Feed the flock of God * * * *not as being lords over God's heritage*, but being ensamples to the flock" (1 Pet. 5, 1-3)!

General Character of the Roman Catholic Church.

In conclusion we will yet point out, in a few words, the general characteristics of the Catholic Church. We get the best view of their doctrinal system if we look at it from the point of view of the article concerning the Church, which occupies the central place. The Church is divided on the one hand into the governing priests, with the bishops and pope at their head,

and on the other hand the obeying laity. On the ground that the priests alone can create the sacrament, they especially exalt them above the laity. But through the sacraments the powers of grace flow into Christians and enable them to obey the precepts of the Church. Now they are enabled to do good works and merit for themselves eternal salvation. The sacraments bring to man continually new powers for good, thus making him better. Indulgences can release from penances which the Church imposes here on earth, and when any one has been consigned to purgatory on account of deficient works of "satisfaction," indulgences and masses for the soul may even there yet help him.

The most glaring characteristics of this doctrinal system may be summed up as follows:

1. It represents a *wordly* Christianity; for where else but in the world did their institutions, so directly contrary to the Scriptures, originate? As, for instance, the position of the priests above the laity, their view concerning good works, their idea that by sin man is only wounded, etc.

2. The second characteristic is that of a *hierarchy* which lords it over the whole system of doctrine; we need only call to mind the claims of the papacy, the power of the priesthood, etc.

3. An exclusively *external element* clings to this system of doctrine; as, for instance, the Holy Ghost is bound to the pope and ecclesiastical councils regardless of their character; faith is no more than assent; sin, as to its nature, is conceived to be simply an

act and not a spiritual condition; much importance is attached to regulations, customs and ceremonies; then, too, their public worship is arranged more with a view to a mysterious impression on the senses than to influencing the heart, thought and will; and, finally, we need only to remind the reader yet of the abuse of indulgences and of amulets.

4. A *legalistic* characteristic is apparent in the manner in which their whole life is made subordinate to the directions of the priesthood, in the great stress laid upon external works, etc.

Appendix.

The Vatican Council and the Old-Catholic Movement.

Since the days of Trent no ecumenical Council had been assembled. On the 8th of December, 1869, such an one, officially designated as "The First Vatican Council," was again opened in Rome. In the proclamation its object had been stated only in very general terms. All the more anxiously did the Catholic world await the results of this Council. And very soon the true purpose of the leading spirits became apparent only too clearly. The point in question was nothing less than the dogmatical fixation of the personal infallibility of the pope. When this purpose became known there arose a storm of indignation. But all dissuasions proved fruitless. Even the counter arguments of a by no means small minority of the

members of the Council availed nothing. The pope's own position in the matter was clearly indicated by his declarations: "As regards infallibility, as Mastai the abbot I always believed it, as Mastai the pope *I feel it*," and: "Tradition am I." Of course the arguments which the defenders of infallibility produced were very weak. Of the passage Luke 22, 32 we have already spoken (p. 115). Even for the view that the viceregent of Christ, as such, must be infallible, they could find no justification in history or experience, but rather the contrary. And what could be said of such arguments as that the pope must be infallible because Peter was crucified with his head downward, in such a way that his head supported the burden of the body: "even so the pope, as the head, supports all Christendom; for he who supports is infallible, and not he who is supported"? Or, as was also seriously maintained, that Peter himself proclaimed his infallibility in Sicily. The inhabitants of Sicily, filled with surprise by this announcement, at once sent a delegation to Mary, who stated that she remembered quite well that her Son had given this authority to Peter! And still, despite all the references of the opposition to Scripture and tradition, to present day consciousness, the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope was made a dogma of the Church on the 18th of July, 1870. The principal sentence of this dogma we gave above (p. 115).

Who can fail to see that, in view of this unheard of doctrine, opposition must soon show itself even in the wider circles of the Catholic Church? It is true, the

German bishops who, at Rome, so boldly opposed the proposition, very soon, one by one, gave a reluctant assent to the new dogma. But men of courage were not wanting to undertake the organization of the opposition movement. In Germany and Switzerland their work was crowned with success. Soon the leaders were thrust out of the Church. Distinct congregations sprung up and their own bishop was chosen. They called themselves *Old-Catholics*, for they wished to remain Catholics and only condemned the *new* Catholic doctrine.

At this point we have only the doctrines of the Old-Catholics to deal with. And in justice to them we must here emphasize the fact that on several points the Old-Catholics have forsaken Romish error; for instance, as regards the immaculate conception and the infallibility of the pope; then, too, by removing the compulsory celibacy of the priests, introducing the vernacular in the use of the liturgy, dropping the worship of the consecrated wafer and rejecting the transmissibility of the merits of the saints. But however much we of the Evangelical¹ Church must rejoice in this, we are just as much bound to recognize the fact that most of the distinctive doctrines of the Romish Church against which we have contended are still in force among the Old-Catholics. They, too, acknowledge, besides the Scriptures, the authority of churchly tradition, teach that in his justification the sinner is *made* just, do not call evil lust sin, speak only

¹We say, Evangelical Lutheran. D. M. M.

of the aid of grace in the appropriation of salvation, and of the reward which man receives for the labor of a Christian life. They retain the seven sacraments, the doctrine of the indelible character of the priestly office, and consequently also divide Christianity into the two classes, clergy and laity, and they retain their faith in the infallibility of a really ecumenical Council. And, finally, however much they try to separate from religion the outward, mechanical, empty formality of Ultramontaniam, the Old-Catholics still retain the invocation of saints, of Mary and the angels, as well as the worship of images and relics.

From all this it follows that we have to deal here, not with an approach to Evangelical faith, but with genuine Catholicism, which, however, has rid itself of the disfigurements and disguises of modern Ultramontaniam and Jesuitism.



Chapter II.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

THE Greek, separated from the Romish Church since the year 1054, rejects the decrees of all the so-called General Church Councils held in the West under Romish auspices since the separation. Hence many errors, which have crept into the Romish Church since that time, are not found in the Greek (for instance, the withholding of the cup and indulgences). But coming less in contact with the Reformation, she did not fortify herself so strongly in those errors which she always held in common with the Romish Church as did the latter. The Reformers held the torch of divine truth, so to speak, before the very eyes of the latter, but she defended herself against it as much as possible for the reason mentioned in John 3, 20, and would have preferred to extinguish the light altogether. But since she did not succeed in this, she fortified and defended herself in her errors, and by all manner of sophistic arts gave them the most deceptive appearance of truth possible. We shall, in the first place, briefly cite those errors which the Greek Church, either wholly or at least in essence, holds in common with the Romish Church, and simply refer to the refutation of them already given. But we add, right here, a few remarks on *the general characteristics of the Greek Church*. For, from what has been said above, the inference might be drawn that she approaches the Evangelical Church more nearly than the Roman Catholic. But such is not the case. With reference to the latter we have seen that her practice often presents a phase altogether different from her doctrine; the same is

true, in a much higher degree, of the Greek Church. She manifests comparatively very little interest in putting her doctrine into practice. The chief thing is, to accept as truth the forms of doctrine handed down from the old Greek Church. She therefore appropriates the name "*Orthodox*." The Greek Church turns her attention especially to the cultus. This was the subject of her conflicts with Rome. When the patriarch Photius in the 9th century, the most learned man of his time, set himself to give Rome a decisive blow, he indignantly charged her with allowing the use of milk, butter and cheese in the first week of Lent, with forbidding priests to marry and allowing them to shave, with regarding the anointing performed by a priest as invalid, and finally with having adulterated the Nicene Creed by the addition of "*Filioque*," *i. e.* and from the Son (see below, I., in the Article concerning God). The great schism in the Church in Russia in the 17th century, which exists even now yet (see below), grew out of a difference of opinion with reference to liturgical books. Whether the Hallelujah should be sung twice or three times during the liturgical service, how the fingers should be held in making the sign of the cross, and such like questions, led to this division! Thus we see that public worship and the liturgy are regarded as the chief thing in Greek Christianity. He is a pious man who regularly takes part in public worship and permits himself to be transported into a state of intense devotion by its mystic forms connected with clouds of incense and with music. The object is to lift the soul up above every thing earthly and sensual until one, with holy awe, feels the nearness of God. But they have not bridged over the space between this rock, mounting up even into heaven, and ordinary every-day life. In other words, their churchly devotion bears no good fruit for the ordering of daily conduct. Practical life and the morals of the citizen are governed by civil laws. Thus it is possible for sincere devotion and intense feeling to be accompanied by a morally corrupt or even an immoral life and coarse manners. There is danger of a

mere Sunday Christianity; the labors of the week are to be measured by other standards. But the week has six work days and only *one Sunday*. * * * The difference between this view and that of the Lutheran Church must be apparent to every attentive reader.

But we proceed to a summary of the distinctive doctrines.

The Greek Church teaches like the Romish:

1. In regard to *Tradition* (I, 4), except that she derives it principally from the Greek Church Fathers, and the seven General Councils.

2. In regard to *Scripture Interpretation* (I, 3), except that by the Church, to which belongs the right of interpreting Scripture, she most decidedly understands only the General Council of bishops not called or ratified by any pope.

3. In regard to the *invocation of saints and angels, and the veneration of images and relics* (II, 1. 2), except that she excludes massive images (such as carved and cast) from churchly use. The worship of saints and images prevails to the greatest extent. As a rule a child receives the name of the saint on whose day he is born or baptized. The saint remains the life-long patron of the child; his intercession is asked for generally in the morning and evening prayers. Among the images of saints those occupy a prominent place which possess miraculous powers. As for the rest, images of saints are found, in large numbers, in all the churches, and also in the dwellings of the people. On entering a room the first thing is to cross one's self before them; in all important events of family life these images play a prominent part.

4. In regard to the *free will* of man (III, 3);—except that she lays still more stress on the freedom of man after the fall than the Romish Church. When salvation is offered to man he has the free will to accept or reject it. In this matter grace comes to his aid, but without laying any constraint on the will.

5. In regard to *human works* besides the merit of Christ (IV, 2);—except that she does not emphasize the idea of merit quite so much, but still maintains that man is justified through faith *and works*.¹ They divide the whole of Christianity into faith and works. In the Russian Catechism the 3d question reads: "What is necessary in order to please God and obtain everlasting salvation? *Ans.*: First the knowledge of the true God, and a true faith; *second*, good works and a life consistent with this faith." By faith they mean assent to the orthodox doctrine.

6. In regard to justifying *grace* (VII, 1);—that the free will of man chooses salvation by the aid of grace. See 4.

7. In regard to the *changing of the bread and wine* into the body and blood of Christ (IX, 1).

8. In regard to the *unbloody offering* of the Lord by the hand of the priest (IX, 6).

9. In regard to the *number of sacraments* (IX, 7), except that:—1. *Confirmation*, *a*, is not based upon

¹We are justified by faith alone (Rom. 3, 28); but works follow this faith as so many fruits of the same; in them the invisible faith gains a visible form, so that we may show it (James 2, 18), and thus it becomes perfect (James 2, 22).

Scripture but upon tradition; *b*, immediately follows *Baptism* as the concluding part of it; *c*, the laying on of hands is omitted, and the ordinary priest may administer it, but the anointing oil must first have been consecrated by a bishop; 2. *Marriage*, in the case of adultery, may be dissolved, the second and third marriage are rendered difficult, the fourth is positively forbidden; 3. and finally, *Extreme Unction* is granted not only to those who are sick unto death, but to all sick persons at their request, and repeatedly; and that, too, according to James 5, 15, both for the salvation of the soul and the restoration of their bodily health; only that she does not emphasize this sufficiently, that in the passage referred to the stress is not laid on the anointing with oil, but on the common prayer of faith.

10. In regard to the *degrees in the priesthood* (XI, 8);—only that she has no infallible pope at the head of all, but four patriarchs instead; of whom the one at Constantinople, according to human right (as Primate), has the precedence, except in the Russian Church, where, since Peter I., the Emperor is the head of the Church and disposes of all ecclesiastical matters by a so-called “holy synod.”

11. In regard to the *intermediate condition* after death (X);—except that she decidedly rejects the idea of a real fire, and restricts the aid which the living can render the souls in the process of purification to prayer, gifts and the mass.

Here follow the errors which the Greek Church holds, not in common with the Romish. She teaches:

I. In the Article Concerning God.

The Holy Ghost proceeds, not from the Father and the Son, but from the Father alone, according to John 15, 26.

Against this observe: It is not said there that He proceeds "only" from the Father; the Son is therefore not positively excluded. On the other hand it is evident from John 16, 15, where the Savior says: "He shall take of mine," that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son also. As for the rest, the real ground for the obstinacy with which they contend that the Spirit proceeds *only* from the Father is no doubt to be found in the all-controlling liturgical interest of the Greek Church. The words "and from the Son" are namely in reality a later addition of the Romish Church to the Nicene Creed, in which they were originally not found.

II. In the Article Concerning Baptism.

In administering baptism it is essentially necessary to immerse three times.

Against this observe: It does not depend upon the quantity, but upon the use of water; for the Greek word which is translated "baptize" means "to wash with water" (Heb. 9, 10) as well as to "immerse in water." Immersion then is by no means essential, but only a good apostolic usage, expressive of the signification of baptism; for in baptism the old Adam is given into death, in order to arise again as a new man.

III. In the Article Concerning the Lord's Supper.

1. The Lord's Supper should be administered also to children.

Against this observe: Children, who cannot yet *examine* themselves, should not receive the Lord's Supper, since each one who wishes to receive it should examine himself (1 Cor. 11, 28).

2. Although the Lord Himself used unleavened bread, yet not unleavened but leavened bread should be used (in order, in this way, to avoid all appearance of the Jewish passover).

Against this observe: It makes no difference, only so it is right, natural bread, leavened or unleavened.

The Corinthian Church evidently used unleavened bread (1 Cor. 5, 6-8), although consisting largely of converted heathens, to whom it might have been a matter of importance to avoid the appearance of Judaism.

IV. In the Article Concerning the Church.

All ministers, except those living in cloisters, and the higher ministers going forth from cloisters, *must marry*, and if the first wife dies, dare not marry a second; both according to 1 Tim. 3, 2.

Against this observe: The passage 1 Tim. 3, 2: "A bishop must be the husband of one wife," neither *commands* marriage, nor *forbids* a second marriage; it says nothing more than that a bishop should not live in the practice of polygamy, for which there was no doubt both opportunity and temptation in a congregation, at that time, to whose members, descended from heathens, there was nothing strikingly immoral in polygamy.

Parties and Sects in the Greek Church.

Among the older factions of the Greek Church which still continue to exist:

1. The *Nestorians* (especially in Persia) teach such a *separation* of the two natures of Christ as cannot be reconciled with His personal unity.

2. The *Monophysites* (especially in Syria, where they are called Jacobites, in Armenia, in Egypt, where they are called Copts, and in Abyssinia) teach a *fusion* of the two natures in Christ.

3. The *Maronites* (mostly on Mt. Lebanon) *so confound the divine and human will* in Christ, that the proposition "Jesus Christ, true God and true man" is virtually annulled.

4. The *United Greeks* (with Rome namely) accept indeed the Scriptural doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and from the Son*; but at the same time also the doctrine of the efficacy of masses for the souls of the living and the dead, and of the supremacy of the pope.

DURING the last centuries a large number of more modern sects, the theatre of whose activity is principally in Russia, has been added to the older factions of the Greek Church. We get some idea of their historic significance when we call to mind that already ten years ago it was claimed that thirteen or fourteen million souls belonged to the Raskólniki (schismatics or sectarians). The Russian sects are generally divided into Popówzy¹ (priestly), *i. e.* such as recognize

¹Y or i is the usual plural ending in the Russian language.

the priesthood of the State Church, and call those priests to officiate among them — according to certain usages — and Bespopówzy (priestless), who in no way recognize the priests of the State Church. It is very evident that this division is an altogether external one. Possibly some better division might take its place. We must speak in the first place of the *Orthodox*, who agree in faith with the State Church, but differ from it in forms and usages; secondly of the *Heterodox*, who in their doctrine plainly deviate from Greek orthodoxy. Then such sects deserve special mention that represent antichristian, mystic and rationalistic doctrines (which have no doubt been taken from the older sects). — Finally we must remark here that our knowledge of these sects is still very imperfect.

Sectarian movements in Russia had their origin in the attempt of the Patriarch *Nikon* to restore the usual cultus forms and formulæ to the original Greek patterns. It was a question pertaining to the order of worship. That in which the people were most deeply interested was attacked. Hence the great excitement which the efforts of the Patriarch aroused.

In what follows we name the most important of the Russian sects.

1. The *Starowerzy* (those holding the ancient faith). When *Nikon*, in 1652, was made Patriarch at Moscow, he found many errors in the liturgical books and in the Slavonic Bible. These had crept in through carelessness in copying and — afterwards — in printing. He resolved to improve the text. He prosecuted this work in the midst of passionate opposition,

due in part to his own harsh manner, and in part to a superstitious veneration for the old liturgical forms. But the opposition grew mightily. A Church Council confirmed the improvements, but Nikon was deposed. Still it was impossible to calm the congregations, excited as they had been by fanatical agitators. They felt themselves wronged in their most sacred interests; they thought that these changed customs and forms possessed peculiar powers. Thus it came to pass that the errors, which Nikon had expunged from the liturgy and the Bible, became a kind of schismatic symbol. In this direction — opposition of the Russian people to the State Church as such — Starowérzianism established itself, especially since the time of Peter I., who, by his reforms, became involved in an irremediable breach not only with the constitution of the Church as handed down by tradition, but with the Russian nationality itself. From that time on the terms “Orthodox” and “old Russian” became more or less synonymous. Peter I. gave offense especially with his beard-reform, which was displeasing on this account already, because it looked so much like compulsory occidental civilization, but all the more hateful because the Council of Moscow, in 1551, had expressly declared that the cutting off of the beard is a sin which even the blood of martyrs cannot wash away, and that he who cuts it off is an enemy of God, who created man in His own image (compare Lev. 19, 27); — whilst now they were to be taxed for letting it stand.

But what was really the subject in dispute in this whole movement against the reforms of Nikon? The answer to this question will help us very much in getting a proper understanding of the peculiar character of the Greek Church. Everywhere it was, first of all, only outward forms and formulæ. The following are the most important: The proper pronunciation of the name "Jesus" in Russian is Jissus (Yissus). Instead of this, by a mistake in copying, Issus had come into use. And to this the Orthodox wanted to adhere. In the phrase "begotten, not made" an "a" (= but) had been inserted. They did not want this taken away. One of the chief opponents of Nikon said: That "a" was always in my book; I believe in that "a." Instead of having the Hallelujah three times after the Gloria, the Orthodox wanted it only twice. Again, they crossed themselves with the first and third fingers; the other three were closed. Nikon wanted them to cross themselves with the first three fingers. In their processions they were guided by the apparent course of the sun; Nikon demanded that they should follow its true course.—To these was added, later on, the prohibition of tobacco, coffee and tea.

Following up later developments among the Orthodox, we are enabled to distinguish several groups. The most important are the *Staroobryadzy* (old ritualists), who reject every approach to the State Church, hold fast to the old usages, but, for the rest, are one in faith with that church. There went out from them, in the year 1800, the *Jedinowierzy* (*i. e.* those sharing the common faith, the united), who hold fast to the old

rites, but accept priests of the State Church who observe them. Finally we mention in this connection the *Bespopowtschiny*, who have no priests at all, but only elders.

2. Linked with these groups which retain essentially the old orthodox position, there are extreme tendencies, rejecting the priesthood altogether. The *Pomorzy* (dwellers by the sea) and *Phillipowzy* (named after their founder, Philip) reject the prayer for the Czar and, adhering to the literal sense of Matthew 3, 11, recommend the baptism of fire by the burning of self. The *Theodosians* (also named after their founder) condemn the priesthood and likewise the sacraments, earnestly oppose churchly marriages (because solemnized by the priests), and, in connection with this, recommend celibacy. They seem also to administer a kind of baptism to those uniting with them. The sect numbers many adherents, and towards the close of the last and in the beginning of the present century, under the guidance of a talented leader, Kopylow, gave promise of great success, especially in Moscow. The *Stranniki* (wanderers) or *Beguny* (runners) lead a vagabond life, ostensibly fleeing from antichrist or the State Church; they look with contempt on matrimony. As for the rest, they accept of adherents who lead a settled life; when sick, and expecting to die, they ask to be carried into the open air, that they may die as though in flight. A very interesting sect is that of the "*Chlysty*" (self-scourgers), who call themselves god-men. It was founded by a peasant named Danila Filippow, to whom God is said to have appeared in

the year 1645 with the command to restore Christianity to its original spiritual condition. God Himself now entered into the body of Filippow; he called himself Sabaoth, and forbade his followers to believe in any other God except the one dwelling in him, and besides this forbade the use of intoxicating drinks, matrimony, the taking part in any lively company, and theft, and commanded faith in the Holy Ghost and hospitality among each other. Presently he named another peasant, Iwán Súsłow, as his Christ. It was claimed that he was twice crucified (by command of the government), but arose again the third day. Both he and Filippow are said to have lived to the age of a hundred years. After Súsłow's death he was succeeded by another Christ. We find among them also the titles "Apostle," "Prophet" and "Mother of God." They boast of special revelations, given them during their religious exercises, where, by self-scourgings and wild dances, they lift themselves into a kind of ecstatic condition. From them went out the *Skopzy* (self-mutilators), founded by a peasant named Andrei Seliwánow about the middle of the last century. As an antidote for the excesses which had appeared among the "god-men" he recommended unmanning, according to Matthew 19, 12; which, originally performed with glowing iron, was to represent the baptism of fire. Seliwánow claimed to be the Christ who had last appeared, the deceased emperor Peter III. According to the view of his adherents, he did not die, but is living at Irkutsk, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead. As for the rest, their

views correspond with those of the "god-men." They too receive revelations during their religious exercises; they reject baptism and the Lord's Supper, but externally adhere to the State Church. — We must here mention yet the "*Springer*" (jumpers), who receive their name from the wild dances which they practice, in their assemblies, for the sake of religious ecstasy.

The origin of the sects hitherto named is traceable to misinterpretations of doctrine handed down, or to the perversion of isolated passages of Scripture. As regards the sects now to be named it is different; they use the doctrines of the Church only as a cloak for their pantheistic views, just as the Gnostics of the ancient Church did. As most prominent among them we name the *Duchoborzy* (spirit-fighters), who appeared in the 18th century. According to their view the Holy Scriptures are only the external word of God; faith is wrought only by the inner word, or the Spirit. Their conception of God is more or less pantheistic, *i. e.* encosmic, as the life of the universe. They confine the idea of "the Son of God" not to the person of Christ alone. Every pious person is a son of God, and the historical Christ was only a pious man. Redemption through Him is not to be thought of; all that He left us is the example of enduring innocent sufferings. Every one who is led by the Spirit of God is free from sinning. Hence the priesthood and the external Church are useless. After death the souls of the pious again enter the bodies of men, those of the wicked the bodies of animals. It is possible that these doctrines were brought into Russia from else-

where, or they may have been handed down from some of the older sects of the Byzantine Church. They are pantheistic doctrines very like those of many of the mediæval sects. Closely related to the Ducho-borzes are the *Molokany* (milk-eaters), so called because in the Lenten season they use milk. As for the rest, there seem to be many varieties of the two last named sects.—The *Subbotniki* (Saturday people) observe Saturday as their holy day, and retain other Old Testament usages. Most probably they are the modern representatives of an older Russian sect, the so-called “Jewish heresy,” which had its headquarters in Novgorod during the fifteenth century. Finally we mention yet the sect of *Nenaschi* (not-ours) or *Moltschaljniki* (silent ones), who seem to deny the existence of God, immortality and all authority of the Holy Scriptures.—We refer here yet to the sect of *Stundists* (Hourists), found in Russia since 1864, and who have recently been much spoken of. It is possible that they owe their origin to the pietistic efforts of German colonists in the south of Russia. In their hours (from which word the sect receives its name) of devotion the Bible is read and explained. As for the rest they seem to regard the sacraments as mere symbols, and baptism is administered only to adults.

These are only the most important manifestations within the Russian Raskól (schism or separation). In general it is to be remarked that for most of these sectarians it is claimed that they are industrious, sober men (which does not agree well with the wild orgies which their opponents lay to their charge), who, how-

ever, show the pride common to most sects, namely of regarding themselves as *the* true Christians, whilst the Church, in their view, is Babel, or the kingdom of Antichrist. The number and growth of these sects should serve as an earnest admonition to the Greek Church.¹

¹Readers conversant with the German, and who wish to know more about the Russian sects, will find an exhaustive description of them in C. R. v. Gerbel-Embach's *Russian Sectarians*. Vol. VIII., No. 4, of *Zeitfragen des christl. Volkslebens*. Heilbronn 1883.



Chapter III.

REFORMED DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES.

IT is not without reason that we here depart from our former captions, and instead of "Distinctive Doctrines of the Reformed Church," say, "Reformed Distinctive Doctrines." The Reformed namely have not one single confession which all approve of and adopt; they are therefore divided into several larger or smaller communions, with confessions differing in a greater or less degree, so that we cannot speak of the errors of the Reformed Church as a whole. It must not be thought, therefore, that each one who is or professes to be of the Reformed Confession, shares all the errors which we propose to enumerate in the following pages, and to refute with evidence from the Scripture. The most important Reformed Confession, however, the one of all which is the most widely circulated and stands in the highest esteem, is the Heidelberg Catechism.

I. The Article Concerning God.

1. God can and may by no means be represented by images. (Heidelberg Catechism, Question 97.)

Against this observe: The Old Testament command, not to make any likeness of God (Exod. 20, 4), was given for an especial reason; for it could not be done except in a purely arbitrary manner, as it is written Isaiah 40, 25: "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One;" nor could it be allowed for this reason, that through the example of the surrounding heathen the Jews might easily have been led to the worship of made images

(Exod. 20, 5). But now since Christ, the essential image of God, has appeared on earth, we can make to ourselves an image of God in Christ, without fashioning the same in a purely arbitrary manner after some creature in heaven, on earth, or under the earth, since the question of God, Isaiah 40, 25, is satisfactorily solved by the declaration of the Lord, John 14, 9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father;" and we *may* also do it, for, as Luther says: "Whether I will or not, when I hear Christ, there is formed in my heart an image of a man hanging on the cross; just as my face is naturally reflected from the water when I look into it. Now if it is not sin, etc. Especially inasmuch as the heart is of more importance than the eyes, and should be less polluted with sin than the eyes, being the true seat and dwelling of God."

2. Images, in general, shall not be tolerated in the churches, because God will not have His people taught by dumb images, but by the living preaching of the Word. (Heid. Cat., Q. 98.)

Against this observe: The word is also an image, namely, an audible one; on the contrary, the image is also a word, namely, a visible one; and thus by no means anything "dumb" (least of all a "dumb idol"); the former makes a more distinct, the latter a more living impression. Now in that church where the Word is taught pure and unadulterated, why may not also a purely evangelical image be placed before the eyes?

3. We love the saints in heaven as brethren, and also honor them, yet without in any wise *venerating* them (Swiss Confession). — Hence, in all Reformed Churches, except the English Episcopal, all days kept in memory of Mary, the Apostles and Martyrs, have been abolished.

Against this observe: If veneration means as much as adoration or invocation, there is no objection to this princi-

ple; but from this it by no means follows that the days so long observed in the Church in memory of Mary, the Apostles and Martyrs, *must* be abolished; for a churchly remembrance of holy men is not equivalent to adoration or invocation. And, if we are to remember the teachers who have spoken to us the Word of God, to follow their faith, and consider the end of their conversation (Heb. 13, 7), we may certainly do this in church even rather than in our dwellings, and that too with united praise and thanks to God who has given His Church such lights and such a cloud of witnesses (Heb. 12, 1).

Remark: The Reformed have a disposition, in general, to abolish everything which was not introduced by the Apostles themselves; and where they are at all strict they demand a direct command in Scripture for every churchly usage, even as Zwingli and his followers once made an earnest attempt to banish even organs and bells from the churches, since they are not mentioned in the Scriptures. In opposition to the false principle: "Whatever is to be regarded as churchly, must be directly commanded, or at least allowed in the Scripture," there stands this true one: "Whatever is to be regarded as churchly, must not be either expressly or implicitly forbidden in Scripture, and, besides, must prove to be wholesome, or at least harmless." And the Lutheran Church did nothing wrong in retaining certain names, things and usages observed in the Romish Church (as the altar, candles on the altar, wafer, etc.), although they are not expressly commanded, or even expressly allowed in the Scriptures: partly as good and useful in themselves (1 Thess. 5, 21), partly also in free Christian love, for the sake of the weak (Rom. 15, 1). On the contrary, with equal right, she has never allowed such things and usages, in themselves neither commanded nor forbidden, to be forced upon her as essentially necessary, or to be forcibly taken from her as utterly to be condemned (as, for example, exorcism in baptism); mindful of the Apostolic word: "Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men" (1 Cor. 7, 23). "Let no man judge you, in meat or in drink or in respect of a

holy day * * * or beguile you of your reward" (Col. 2, 16-18).

We find also, in connection with this external estimate of the Word, that the Reformed congregations were at first loth to sing any other than Biblical hymns, *i. e.* the Psalms; that a Reformed Confession of 1647, declared the Hebrew vowel points to be inspired; that the English Bible Society will not have the Apocrypha printed and circulated in the common editions of the Bible. * * * But in connection with this external estimate of the Word, the partial want of real submission to the same is not becoming, which manifests itself, in regard to certain mysterious, though clear and indisputable doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, in such expressions as these: "It goes beyond reason," etc. "It troubles the mind," etc. "What does it profit?" In regard to such expressions as these Luther says: "Even if we cannot show *how* it profits and is necessary that Christ's body be in the bread, should therefore God's Word be false or perverted to suit our whims? A pious, God-fearing heart proceeds in this way: It asks first whether it is God's Word; if it hears this, it casts under its feet the question wherefore it is profitable or necessary; for in fear and humility it says: O my God, I am blind and do not truly know what is profitable or necessary for me, nor do I want to know it (of myself), but believe and trust Thee, that Thou knowest and intendest the best for me, according to Thy divine goodness and wisdom; it is enough for me, and I am also glad that I hear Thy plain Word and comprehend Thy will. This alone is faith's chief virtue, characteristic and honor, that it does not wish to know whereunto that is profitable or necessary which it believes. For it does not wish to circumscribe God, or to set up the question, why, or wherefore, from what necessity He bids or commands this or that; but faith would rather be unwise, give God the honor, and believe His mere Word. Was it not the same over-curious question, Why has God commanded this? which caused our mother Eve to doubt God's Word by which she brought upon herself and upon

us all the fall? Or, what blessing would Abraham have obtained, if, when God commanded him to offer up his son, he had asked whereunto this was profitable or necessary? Yet, although we are under no obligation to do it, we shall even beyond necessity, show why," etc.

In another passage he says: "Nevertheless one ground they have which I regard the strongest of all, which they honestly hold, and I believe it is true; it is this: They say it staggers the people (when they hear) that one body is at the same time in heaven and in the Lord's Supper. * * * As regards all their other grounds and so much writing, they might long since have kept silent. * * * For from this source flow all their other doubts and denials. Nor would they have pressed these latter so much if the former had not urged them to do so. Here then is the trouble: To whom anything seems difficult to believe, let him believe and say it is not true; then certainly it is not true, as from this premise it may be proved. Therefore, according to them, it is certainly not true that Christ is God and man, for it is difficult, yea, impossible to believe," etc.

II. Of the Person of Christ.

1. Christ, who ascended to heaven, is present upon earth only with respect to His divine, but not with respect to His human nature; from which it does not follow that the two natures in Christ are separated from one another. (Heid. Cat., Q. 47 and 48.)

Against this observe: The divine attribute of omnipresence is indicated in Scripture in a twofold manner; at one time by the expression, "God fills heaven and earth" (Jer. 23, 24); and again by the expression, "The heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain God" (1 Kings 8, 27). Both expressions are also applied to Christ (Eph. 4, 10): "He ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all

things." And Heb. 7, 26, it is also said that "He is higher than the heavens"; from which it necessarily follows that it (heaven) cannot contain Him. But that Christ is spoken of with regard to His human¹ nature, in the passages referred to, cannot be questioned. Or has not Christ, with regard to His divine nature, in all time filled all things, and was He not, from the very beginning, higher than the heavens? Must He then first *ascend*, to fill all things and to *become* higher than the heavens? With this compare Matt. 28, 18-20. There the Lord says that all power is given to Him in heaven and on earth. According to which nature? Evidently the human! For according to the divine He had it already from eternity. But if, according to His human nature, all power is given to Him on *earth*, how could this be possible, if He were not *present* on earth? Omnipotence and omnipresence are intimately connected. Therefore, in conclusion, He adds the other attribute also, namely omnipresence: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

In how far, however, the two natures in Christ are indeed separated (after the manner of the Nestorians) by this Reformed error will be shown from Luther further on.

Remark: The Formula of Concord (see Jacobs' ed., p. 619) distinguishes a threefold manner of Christ's presence:

1. The comprehensible and corporeal. According to this He walked on earth, was touched and seen.

2. The incomprehensible and spiritual. According to this He passed through closed doors, and penetrates the elements in the Lord's Supper without being confined in them.

3. The divine and heavenly. According to this He is not only not included in created things, but Himself em-

¹That Christ, even according to His human nature, fills all things, does not imply that His human nature extends over everything; but means only so much, that ordinary space presents no limit to it.

braces all, and as, according to the second mode, *matter* has no limits, so, according to the third, *space* has no limits for Him. * * * Now our bodies shall hereafter partake of the attributes of our spirits, and become spiritual bodies (1 Cor. 15, 46); then the second manner, which may also be called the angelic, will be at our command; matter will cease to have limits for our bodies, even as it cannot contain our spirits. Now in a similar manner as our bodies shall partake of the attributes of our spirits, the human nature in Christ partakes of the attributes of the divine; it is divinified, and thus space has no longer any limits for it, even as it has not for the divine nature. Now to whomsoever it does not seem inconsistent that our bodies should once not be limited by matter, to him certainly it cannot seem inconsistent that Christ, the God-man's, human nature should not be circumscribed by space.

"Christ is every where present, but not in the same way in heaven and on earth. So too He is present in all places on earth, but in various ways. His omnipresence differs from the presence of which He grants His disciples a sense in the hour of prayer, or which He permits the sinner seeking grace to realize. Every good gift comes from the Lord. As often as our mind and heart are opened to receive these gifts, the Lord Himself is present, and lets us realize it. But He Himself is not the gift; in all His gifts, the natural as well as the spiritual, He distinguishes between the gift and Himself. In so far *that* gift is still wanting on earth, which is He Himself; from which He no more separates Himself, with, in and under which He gives us His entire self. This gift the Christian either does not find at all here below — or, as an anticipation, in the Sacrament, in which the Lord, with, in and under the natural elements, gives Himself to us, as to His body, soul and spirit, as to His flesh, blood and consciousness, in order to strengthen, vivify, refresh and permeate our body and soul within us. In the Sacrament man is touched (*berührt*) not only in spirit, but also in body and soul, by the body, blood and spirit of Christ."

2. Upon the whole, it is not to be taken literally, when divine attributes are ascribed to the human nature of Christ in the Bible, for a finite nature is not capable of infinite attributes.¹

Against this observe: In John 3, 34, it is said that God giveth not the Spirit by measure, *i. e.* in immeasurable fullness.² To whom? As the context indicates, to the Son. According to His divine nature? No; according to this He ever had the Spirit, since the Holy Spirit, from eternity, proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, and He did thus not first have to be given unto Him. According to His human nature, therefore, He received the Spirit not by measure, and thus the proposition that the finite nature of Christ was indeed not only *capable* of infinite gifts, but really also *partaker* of them, is clearly proven from the Scriptures. But what else can be meant by these infinite gifts than *divine* attributes? for they alone are without measure. If this be true, however, then those passages of Scripture which, as the Reformed themselves admit, sound indeed as if the human nature possessed divine attributes (Matt. 28, 18; Matt. 16, 27; Acts 17, 31), may not be otherwise understood than as they read. * * * Besides, this partaking of the attributes of the divine on the part of the human nature, even if it were not expressly taught in Scripture, would follow as a necessary consequence of the union (admitted even by the oppo-

¹See, for example, the Confessio Anhaltina, VIII, 3. The Confessio Belgica remarks that the human nature has indeed won immortality through the resurrection, but has thereby undergone no change.

²That "not by measure" should mean no more than "very richly" does not correspond with the following: "He hath given all things (and not only 'many,' as consistency would require) into his hands."

sition) of the divine and human natures in one person, for the attributes cling to the nature, so that if the two natures united in one person have a communion with each other, this last cannot take place without a reciprocal communication of attributes. Therefore, whoever denies that the human nature partakes of the divine attributes, denies the real communion of the two natures; and this is precisely what is done from the Reformed point of view, where there is a decided tendency to regard the infinite only as the inflexible opposite of the finite, not, however, as at the same time penetrating and governing the finite.

3. Christ did not really descend into hell, but has merely, both before and during His crucifixion, suffered in His soul the anguish of hell for our benefit. (Heid. Cat., Q. 44.)

Here note first of all that here we have a very difficult doctrine to deal with; one with reference to which even such a man as Luther wavered for a long time. The view which he finally adopted we find recommended in the Formula of Concord as the "safest"; but, as to the particulars, no positive doctrine is set forth in the Confession. Herein, then, the Lutheran Church also stands opposed to the Reformed. Soon after His burial, namely, Christ as God and man descended to hell; there He took away the power of Satan and "destroyed hell for all believers." This view is based especially on the passage 1 Pet. 3, 18-20: "Being put to death in the flesh," *i. e.* according to His humanity (according to which He had power to lay down His life), He was "quickened by the Spirit," *i. e.* by the power of the Divinity (according to which He had power again to take His life which He had laid down), and thus, before showing Himself alive to the living, He descended to the unsaved dead, *i. e.* to hell. From this, therefore, namely that the Christ again made alive descended to hell, it is evident why the old Lutheran dogma-

ticians assigned the descent to hell to the state of exaltation, whilst, according to the Reformed, it belongs to the state of humiliation.³

³The editor believes that he will be rendering service to some of his readers, who may still be troubled with serious doubts on this very subject of the descent to hell, by calling attention to another way in which it may be understood. According to the Scriptures every being endowed with a body is alive only so long as it is in the body. The awakening of the flesh is therefore always, at the same time, the resurrection of the body. Christ, who certainly now lives in the body, was therefore made alive again through His resurrection. From the Reformed view it would follow that Christ was made alive again even before His resurrection. Again we remark here that the expression "hell" (sheol, hades) as used in the Bible does not necessarily mean the abode of the unsaved, but of the dead (see for instance Ps. 6, 6; 16, 10; Acts 2, 27-31; Matt. 16, 18; 1 Cor. 15, 55, etc.). The words: "Dead and buried, He descended into hell" are therefore to be explained thus: He died and, as to His body, was buried, but as to His spiritual "I," like all the dead, descended to the lower parts of the earth to the abode of the dead. The passages of the New Testament which speak of the descent to hell agree well with this interpretation (Matt. 12, 40; Acts 2, 24; Rom. 10, 7. It is doubtful whether Eph. 4, 9-10 belongs here; 1 Pet. 4, 6, certainly does *not*). The passage 1 Pet. 3, 19-20, is the only one that gives us any difficulty; for, when His preaching to the spirits in prison, who were disobedient at the time of the flood, is spoken of, it seems after all that Christ was in the lower regions, alive, before His resurrection. But, this explanation of 1 Pet. 3, 19, just given, is also involved in difficulties. If Christ was quickened only on the third day, at the time of His resurrection, how could He, before that, preach in the lower regions? What did He preach there, and with what result? This would have to be stated, for these are not questions that explain themselves:

III. Of Grace.

1. To the glorification of His own praise God resolved first to create man good, then to permit his fall, and finally, *without regard to belief or unbelief*, to have mercy upon and elect some of His fallen creatures to everlasting life, to the praise of His *grace*; but to

their answers are very divergent. Finally, if the dead were to hear Christ's preaching, why not all of them, but only those of the time of the flood? In view of these questions we may here yet remind the reader that there is still another explanation of this passage, viz. that first given by Augustine. According to this, the descent of Christ to hell is not spoken of here at all; Christ was "quickened by the Spirit", and that by the same Spirit in which He went once in the days of Noah to preach to the spirits which are *now* in prison. We may just as well speak of the preaching of Christ in the days of Noah, as in chap. 1, 10, the spirit of the Old Testament prophets is spoken of as the Spirit of Christ, or 1 Cor. 10, 4 speaks of Christ as having accompanied Israel in the journey through the desert. The self-witnessing of God takes place namely in the Old Testament also, through the activity of Christ. But Peter is speaking of the time of Noah because he wants to draw a comparison between the flood and baptism. The whole train of thought in this passage, then, is this: Christ is now quickened by the Spirit as He was then when He preached to the contemporaries of Noah. As at that time there was a deliverance by water, so there is even now.— But, be that as it may. Accepting this or that view of the descent to hell, it affords us practically the same consolation, which the Formula of Concord thus expresses: "Thus we retain the substance [sound doctrine] and [true] consolation that neither devil nor hell can take captive or injure us and all who believe in Christ." (Form. Con., Jacobs' ed., p. 643.)

permit others to remain in condemnation, and finally to consign them to everlasting punishment, to the praise of His *justice*.¹

Against this observe: 1. Whoever says that God proposes to reveal His grace in some and His justice in others, separates the divine attributes (whose center is holy love, and which, proceeding from this center, always work together) in the most arbitrary manner, as if, instead of mutually penetrating each other, they were only superficially connected. 2. God created man free, in order that he might be a partaker of the highest good. Of course, with this was given the *possibility* of abusing his liberty; nay, God in His omniscience foresaw the *reality*, that man would in fact abuse it; yet, He created him, not however with the predetermined *purpose*, that after he should have fallen, to reveal in some His grace and in others His justice, but, with the only purpose worthy of a divine Being, to save *all* penitent and believing sinners for Christ's sake. 3. The ninth chapter of Romans, to which the defenders of an unconditional predestination to salvation or condemnation refer, by no means justifies such a doctrine. In verses 9-13 it is not said that Jacob had been predestined to salvation and Esau to condemnation, without regard to belief or unbelief, but only that, without regard to merit or guilt, the royal-priestly right of the first-born (which is described Gen. 49, 3) was given to Jacob, but withheld from Esau ("the elder shall serve the younger").

Further, verses 15 and 16 do not refer to the general grace necessary to everlasting life, but to God's special gracious dealings (not necessary to salvation) with Moses, who desired to see God's glory here below already with his bodily eyes (Exod. 33, 17-23).

¹The *Confessio Gallicana*, the *Confessio Belgica*, and the *Canons of the Dordrecht-Synod* express themselves most decidedly on this subject.

Furthermore, from verses 17 and 18 there follows *necessarily* only this, that all those, who obstinately harden themselves against God's Word and Spirit, He finally, according to a just decree, gives over to the hardness of their hearts, as vessels of wrath fitted (by Satan, namely, through their own fault), to destruction, verse 22, henceforth withdraws from them His active grace, and thus hardens them: all this however, only after He has endured them with much long-suffering, verse 22, and after He has tried in vain all means and ways to enlighten, draw and urge them to repentance, by His most wholesome Word, by unmerited blessings and well-deserved afflictions, as may easily be seen in the example of Pharaoh. * * * And even in His judgment to hardness of heart which He passes upon the individual, He has His gracious design upon the whole ("that His name might be declared throughout all the earth," v. 17); for to this end He had raised up Pharaoh, of whom He knew before that he would not receive His grace, *i. e.* had permitted him to come into existence, to occupy so high a station, and to live so long, in order that, when the measure of his sins should be full and judgment come upon him, many secure sinners "throughout all the earth," verse 17, hearing of this example of God's just punishment, might be thereby wholesomely terrified, and through a sincere conversion give God's holy and almighty name the honor.

Summary: The adduced passages by no means *necessarily* lead to the doctrine of predestination in the sense of Calvin; the whole analogy of Scripture, which, according to the example of the Lord (Matt. 4, 7) and the word of the Apostle (Rom. 12, 7), we must follow in the explanation of Scripture, is against it; else with the Calvinists we must take for granted that there is only the *appearance* of a will in such passages as, "God will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. 2, 4), and, "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all" (Rom. 11, 32), and make God a hypocrite, who speaks otherwise than He means. Finally, Paul himself, in the end of the chapter (ninth of Romans),

plainly indicates that God, in His merciful dealings, does not act arbitrarily, *i. e.* without regard to a believing or unbelieving conduct on the part of man, by assigning their unbelief as the reason why the Jews were cast away, verses 32-33. Finally, such doctrine cannot be reconciled with the experience of Christian faith, nor with that which we learn of God's ways in our daily communion with Him. God is not arbitrariness personified, He is love, love unfeigned; and, where His Word has not prevailed, we know that the fault has lain with man alone.

2. He inclines the hearts of those whom He has predestined to everlasting life, to faith, through His Word and Spirit; whilst He calls all others only *externally* through the Word, but does *not* accompany it with His Spirit to make it *effective* in their hearts."

Against this observe: Since God on His part earnestly desires that all men should be saved, He must also give the means therefor; for whoever really desires the *end*, will also provide the *means*. But, since no man can be saved except he believe, and all men are by nature unbelieving and can be brought to faith only by God's grace, He must also have the will to work faith in all, without exception; so that, where no faith appears, it is altogether the fault of man, who opposes this work of God.

Besides, the above distinction between Word and Spirit, and an external call through the Word and an internal call through the Spirit, is opposed to all Scripture; for the Word of God is *Spirit* (John 6, 63), so that where the Word resounds the Spirit also works; hence also the very same attributes and operations are ascribed to the Word as to the

* See the Canons of the Dordrecht Synod, Chap. I., Art. VII; the Westminster Confession, Chap. X. (likewise the Catechismus, major and minor); the Consensus Genevensis on the "Eternal Election of God."

Spirit; like Him, it enlightens (2 Pet. 1, 19), like Him, it regenerates (1 Pet. 1, 23; James 1, 18), like Him, it sanctifies (John 17, 17). The Spirit does not *hover over* the Word, but comes to us *in* and *with* the Word.

Remark: The difference between the Lutheran and Reformed confession begins already in the doctrine concerning the Word. The Reformed confession makes it a mere *guide* to eternal life; but the Lutheran confession, in accordance with the Scripture, a real *means* of grace, which not only shows where to get the treasure, but also imparts it; for it is a *power* unto salvation (Rom. 1, 16), a seed of regeneration (1 Pet. 1, 23), *full* of Spirit and life (John 6, 63).

3. The grace of God works *irresistibly*, so that where God begins to convert, man is compelled to let himself be converted.³

Against this observe: The Scripture knows nothing of such a gracious compulsory will; nay, it rather testifies in the most decided manner, that man *can* resist, and always *has* resisted the Holy Ghost (Acts 7, 51; Gen. 6, 3), and always most earnestly exhorts us to offer no resistance to the work of the Holy Spirit in us. Hence we may, by virtue of the liberty which God once gave us (but which, since the fall, has no power except for evil), resist the converting grace of God, which would work in us "both to will and to do" (Phil. 2, 13), and in this sense resist His will, because even this is His will, that we should be able to do it.

4. Those who have once received the Holy Spirit, cannot again lose Him altogether, nor fall altogether out of God's grace, much less be finally lost.⁴

³See the Canons of the Dord. Synod, IV. 8.

⁴See Canons of the Dord. Synod, V., and the Confession of the Scotch Church, XVII.

Against this observe: When David prays: "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me," the possibility of losing Him is certainly implied. But read especially Heb. 6, 4, where it is expressly said, that those also who have become partakers of the Holy Spirit can fall away, and that in such a way that they *must* be lost. (Heb. 10, 26-29, and also Ezekiel 18, 24.)⁵

5. The elect are also internally *certain* that they are the children of God, that they will continue in the faith unto the end and finally be saved, only that through weakness on account of sin they do not always feel it (Heid. Cat.).⁶

Against this observe: Each one can and should undoubtedly be certain in spirit that he is a child of God, "for the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8, 16); we should also be certain beyond a doubt, that God, who has commenced the work of sanctification in us, will on His part complete it (so sure "that we would die upon it a thousand times"); for "faithful

⁵From 1 John 2, 19, they would infer, contrary to the whole analogy of Scripture, that a person who has once been truly converted can no more fall away; for, say they, the Apostle characterizes those who separated themselves from the Church as those who at heart had never really belonged to it. But it is not said there that they *never* belonged to it, for the words, "they were not of us," do not necessarily imply more than this, that *at that time*, when they externally separated themselves, they did not really belong to them. They may therefore, if they were not confirmed hypocrites, have once been really converted, but had, in this case, neglected to "make their calling and election sure."

⁶The Canons of the Synod of Dord. based this internal certainty, among other things, "upon the earnest and holy diligence in keeping a good conscience and doing good works!" This is building one's house upon sand.

is He that calleth you, who also will do it" (1 Thess. 5, 23), "for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." But whether we, on our part, will give diligence to make our calling and election sure (2 Pet. 1, 10), and be faithful unto the end, as to this we cannot be perfectly certain, on account of the sin which still cleaves to us, and may at any time become a snare for us.

IV. Of the Work of Christ.

*Christ did not die for all sinners, but only for the elect.*¹

Against this observe: The elect, according to the Scripture, are those who continue faithful unto death. But there are many who believe only for a while (Luke 8, 13), but in time of temptation fall away. Now since these also were sanctified by the blood of the covenant (Heb. 10, 29), Christ must have shed His blood for them also; and not only for them, but for those also who never believe, not even for a while, for "He tasted death for every man" (Heb. 2, 9, compare with Rom. 5, 18; 1 John 2, 2), and thus, as all men taken together are indeed very many, He shed His blood for *many* for the remission of sins (Matt. 26, 28), and not only for the few elect.

V. Of Baptism.

✓ Baptism is not merely a *figure*, that like as the filthiness of the body is washed away with water, so also our sins are washed away by the blood and Spirit of Christ, (which are really the active causes,) but it is also a *seal* of the thing signified, that as certainly as the one is done the other takes place; it (Baptism) does not therefore *effect* regeneration, but is a mere *figure* and *seal* of it. (Heid. Cat., Q. 69, etc.)

¹See the Formula Consensus Helvetica, XVI.

Against this observe: If there is really nothing more in Baptism, how strange that our Lord, when He meets His disciples the last time, commands them to make disciples of all nations by baptizing and teaching them (Matt. 28, 19-20)! Baptism, which is called the washing of regeneration (Tit. 3, 5), is not only a sign and seal, but also an effective cause of the same, for we are, as our Lord expressly declares (John 3, 5), to be born again of *water* and the Spirit.

So then the blood (Heb. 10, 22) and the Spirit are not the only active causes in regeneration, but water must be added as the third; and in this sense, namely, that the blood is the *meriting*, the Spirit the *appropriating*, and the water the *mediating* cause.

The Spirit, however, works through the water in Baptism in so far as the same is connected with the divine Word of command and promise; for, since the Word of God is Spirit, and Baptism is a washing of water by the Word (Eph. 5, 26), it is also a washing of water by the Spirit.

Remark: 1. Sometimes (especially where they justify infant Baptism) the Reformed Confessions regard Baptism only as a seal of the covenant in the sense of Zwingli, with whom it was nothing more nor less than the solemn reception into Christian fellowship. 2. Of the *Baptism of Necessity* the Reformed Church, for the most part, knows nothing, because she does not rightly understand the *necessity* of Baptism. Those among them who cling to the doctrine set forth in III, 2 (p. 151), maintain that the germ of faith is in the elect children already before their Baptism (*i. e.* from their birth on).

VI. Of the Lord's Supper.

- ✓ 1. Bread and wine are mere signs (that as bread and wine sustain temporal life, so the crucified body and shed blood of Christ are the true meat and drink wherewith our souls are fed to eternal life) and at

the same time pledges of the thing signified. (Heid. Cat., Q. 75, etc.)

Against this observe: The relative position of the New Testament to the Old, as regards those gifts to be imparted by our Lord Jesus Christ, is that of the finished painting to the sketch (Heb. 10, 1), thus of the greater to the less. But the Passover, with its *real* flesh and blood, is a much plainer sign and seal of the flesh and blood of Christ than bread and wine, which, without a preceding explanation, would not remind any one of flesh and blood; if therefore, bread and wine were nothing more than pictures and signs, the believers of the Old Testament, with their Passover, had, not *less* but *more* than the believers of the *New* with theirs (1 Cor. 5, 7), and the Disciples might very properly have said: "Master, let us rather keep (retain) the Passover, if Thou art about to give us figures and signs, for the Passover, with its ceremonies, signifies Thy body and blood, Thy sufferings and death, much more plainly than bread and wine in the Lord's Supper." Besides, our Lord Himself evidently seems to compare the New Testament with the Old, to the advantage of the former, when He says: "This is *my* blood of the New Testament," as if He would say: And *now* this is my *own* blood (Heb. 9, 12), something much better than the strange blood of the paschal lambs of the Old Testament, which only foreshadowed my blood. It is therefore altogether incomprehensible how any one can dare to pervert such plain, essential words of the Lord: "This is my blood," etc., to mere figures and signs, after the manner of the Old Testament, since it is known that the law (or Old Testament) had the shadow of good things to come, and not the things themselves, like the New Testament. Christ abolished the shadowy images of Old Testament types and the compulsion of particular ordinances; how then could He, on such solemn occasions as those when He instituted the Lord's Supper and Baptism, again have given them an ordinance pertaining only to outward observances?

Remark: The Zwinglian view brings the significance of the Lord's Supper still further down, viz. that bread and wine are only memorials of the sacrificed body and blood of Christ.

2. The body and blood of Christ are present, not *in* and *under*, but (at most) only *with* the bread; of course not really, for after His humanity Christ is confined to heaven, and cannot come down to us; but unreally, for whilst we partake of the bread our faith lifts itself up, in the power of the Holy Spirit, above everything "visible, fleshly and earthly," and we become partakers of His real body and blood.¹

Against this observe: We have no right whatever to depart from the sense² of the word nearest at hand, especially when it is testamentary, without the most cogent reasons. But the passage John 6, 63, so often referred to by the Reformed, by no means furnishes such a cogent reason; for (mere human) flesh (which the Capernaïtes thought of) is indeed not profitable for imparting eternal life (v. 51. 53), but the flesh of Christ is profitable, in whom dwelt bodily the "Spirit" of God, who giveth life, so that even His words were full of divine spirit and life. If the flesh of Christ, the Son of God and man, had not been profitable for the imparting of eternal life, He could not have given it "for the life of the world" (v. 51), and John would not have said: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." The passage therefore gives no

¹See the Scotch Confession, 21.

²It does not depend upon the little word "is"; even if this were altogether wanting, and it were only said: "This my body," the first sense would still not be: This signifies my body, or: This represents my body, or: This assures you of my body.

right whatever to depart from the plain meaning. Besides it is doubtful whether the passage John 6, 57, etc., treats of the Lord's Supper expressly, for in the first place no mention is made of the wine, as would have been necessary had the Lord designed to refer to His Supper; in the second place verse 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood ye have no life in you," hardly agrees with such an interpretation. For this last passage seems to pertain not to the Supper but to the whole work of Christ; for to have eternal life He must be received just as bread must be eaten to sustain temporal life. Aside from this however, there are other passages which confirm us in, and directly restrict us to, this meaning. According to 1 Cor. 11, 29, when we eat of the blessed bread we are to discern the body of the Lord, from which it evidently follows that it must be present in and under the bread,¹ for how shall I discern the body of the Lord when it is not at all present?

¹The Roman Catholics say: The bread *becomes* the body of Christ; we, on the contrary, say: No, we receive it under the form of bread. The Reformed say, indeed, Yes, we receive the body with the bread, but mean, whilst we are eating the bread. We, on the contrary, say: We receive it really with, *i. e.* in the bread. "Not, however," says Luther, "as if we would confine the body of Christ in the bread or wine, but when the Fathers, or we, sometimes say, 'Christ's body is in the bread,' it is done simply for the reason that our faith would confess that Christ's body is there. * * * But even if Christ's body is everywhere, you must not think that you can immediately grasp it; God's right hand is also everywhere, but at the same time nowhere and incomprehensible, without and above all creatures. It is one thing if God is present and another if He is present 'for you.' For you He *is* present when He gives His word, pledges Himself by it and says: Here you shall find me. So, also, since Christ's humanity is at the right hand of God, and now also in all and over all things, like God's right hand, you will not be

And how could it have been such a great sin for the Corinthians who in social assembly allowed a mere symbolical observance to take place without paying to it due respect? (Compare also v. 27 and chapt. 10, 16). Had a crucifix been thus passed around would any one have judged it thus sinful if it had been passed on without so much as a look at it? But in order that we may not undervalue the doctrine of the Apostle, so intimately connected with the words of the institution, he has affixed to it his apostolic seal when he says: "I have received it of the Lord."

Now as regards the above quoted error, it rests in the first place upon a disregard^a of the bodily, which, if consist-

able to seize Him, though He be in your bread, except through His Word He bind Himself and direct you to a certain table, and Himself interpret the bread for you through His Word, which He does here in the Lord's Supper, when He says: 'This is my body.'"

^aSometimes also upon a misunderstanding, as if the oral were a Capernaïtic, *i. e.* a gross, fleshly participation. Sartorius, in his book "Of Holy Love," thus expresses himself with regard to this misunderstanding: "Those who would partake of Christ only *in effigy*, because the partaking of His being seems to them, according to the Capernaïtic idea, to be something horrid, do not consider that if the signs are to represent His massive earthly body, the partaking of the same *in effigy* is also most horrid. But when we contemplate not so much the gross mass of His earthly body, but much rather the ethereal essence of the divine, glorified body (1 Cor. 15, 44 sq., Phil. 3, 21), all coarse, fleshly and shocking representations are removed, and only a participation of love takes place, which is just as little repulsive, nay, even more tender and affectionate than when a mother feeds her infant with her own flesh and blood from her breast. If it seems unworthy to any that the mouth should be the sensual, mediating organ of the super-sensual communication, to him also in general it must seem unworthy that the soul should have

ently carried out, must lead to a denial of the resurrection of the body; and in the second place then in the notion that the right hand of God, to which the humanity of Christ has been exalted, is a certain locality, whilst the truth is, that the right hand of God is everywhere. But if Christ is God and man then indeed must His humanity be everywhere and not inclosed in a certain place as the Reformed teach, and of which Luther derisively inquires whether Christ dwell there as a stork does in his nest? and what conception they have of the local existence of the Lord, whether perhaps as being seated upon a golden chair or as taking a walk or as making music with the angels? But the presumption, however, that by faith we ascend above everything earthly and visible to the Lord, instead of His coming down to us; that we, through our weak faith, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, thus do more than, according to the Reformed view, the Lord Himself, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells *bodily*, can do, according to His humanity; this gross presumption does not at all agree with the word of God (Rom. 10, 6-8), and so far exceeds the usual order of things, even in spiritual matters, that if we were required to come up to it, we would every time have to be caught up into the third heaven, as was the Apostle, *i. e.* into the heaven of glory (2 Cor. 12), and thus the Lord's Supper would no more serve to *strengthen* our weak faith, but much rather *prove* our strong faith.

3. The participation of the body and blood of Christ takes place *spiritually*, through faith, not orally.¹

Against this observe: We must generally not understand it too literally when the Reformed Confession speaks

a body, and especially that the speaking mouth and hearing ear are the portals through which, by means of the word, spiritual thoughts proceed from and enter into the spirit of man."

¹See Confessio Belgica, XXXV.

of partaking of the body and blood of Christ. For the most part they understand thereby nothing more than the partaking of the power of Christ's sufferings and death,² which is, substantially, imparted to us already in the word; or at most they understand thereby an increased enjoyment on the part of faith, of the divine human image in consequence of a certain spiritual exaltation,³ even if the expressions sometimes sound stronger.

Yet, granted that they always mean a real partaking of the true body and blood of Christ, we cannot understand why they would always have it in a spiritual and not oral (even if supernatural) manner, since the Scripture words, "Eat, this is my body," and, "Drink, this is my blood," undoubtedly indicate an oral participation.

Remark: By insisting upon an oral participation, the Lutheran Church does not at all deny the "spirituality" of the food itself, for if ever our glorified bodies shall be "spiritual," how much more must this be true of the body of Christ, in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily.

4. "This sacrament is of no benefit to the impenitent, nor are they partakers of the true body and blood of Christ." (For, those who are not elect unto salvation receive nothing in the Lord's Supper but empty signs, just as when they hear the calling word, they perceive nothing but an empty sound.)

Against this observe: It not only profits them nothing, but positively injures them, for they eat and drink condem-

²See the Consensus Tigurinus, in the collection of Reformed Confessions by Niemeyer, p. 215.

³In the Confessio Gallicana, for example, it is indeed said that we are quickened through the substance of the body and blood of Christ, but immediately afterwards it is said, that it is not indeed *received*, but *apprehended*, by faith.

nation to themselves; but they are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, for it is not written: "Whosoever shall eat * * * unworthily, receives nothing more than bread," but "shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

In this respect bread and wine sustain the same relation as the word; the latter is also full of the Spirit, whether we hear it in faith or not, even as bread and wine are penetrated by the body and blood of Christ, equally as much whether it be received in faith or not. But if the word is to be a blessing to us, we must approach it in faith; otherwise it hardens us; even so, if the sacrament is to be a blessing to us we must come to it in faith, otherwise it condemns us.

Remark: The Reformed insist upon the following as two necessary things:

1. That the sacrament must be received with the hand, and not with the mouth, and for proof refer to the command of the Lord, "Take." This is no proof in their favor; for we take just as well with the mouth as with the hand (as our Lord Himself, when nailed to the cross, took the vinegar with His mouth, John 19, 30).

2. That the bread be broken. Now it is indeed true, that the breaking of the bread, which by the way is a figure of the body of Christ, is also a figure of the violent death He suffered, although His body was not broken; and since the breaking of the bread so often spoken of in the Scriptures serves the imparting of it, likewise the Lord Himself here breaks it since He had before Him the entire passover loaf. Nevertheless and for that very reason it remains a non-essential ceremony, which may be observed or not; for if we would retain all the merely accidental external circumstances, we would, for instance, have to celebrate the Lord's Supper in the night, and the bread would have to be baked after the manner of the Jewish passover bread. But the Reformed Church insists on these two points, on the one hand, because she thinks that if the sacrament be presented to the mouth of the communicant, the minister is made a priest,

superior to the laity, in the Romish sense; on the other hand, because she fears, if the bread be not broken, the Lord's Supper may lose something of its figurative character, in which she makes all its importance to consist.

But that she is, in part, so decidedly opposed to the wafer, which the Lutheran Church has retained as a non-essential, because it has been so long customary in the Church, and is convenient for administration, this arises out of her aversion to everything which might in the least remind them of papal abominations, especially the abominations of the mass.

On this ground also, as well as the one adduced above for placing the elements into the hand of the communicant, she also ignores altogether private confession¹ before the pastor, as such: she has the "general" confession before the Lord's Supper, but prefers to call it "preparation," and this quite in harmony with her view of the Lord's Supper, according to which the communicant must indeed render more than he receives, since his faith is to soar far above every thing earthly, in order, however, in the end, to receive little more than is already spiritually imparted by the word.

Finally, from the two reasons just adduced, as well as the third, that bread and wine are mere signs and seals, we find in the Reformed Church, instead of the consecration proper (by repeating the words of the institution over the elements), an edifying address, directed to the congregation, reminding them of the history of the institution and the object of this holy act.

VII. Of the Office of the Keys.

The Reformed minister does not forgive and retain sins in God's stead, but only announces that sins

¹"If sin oppresses us, private confession serves that we may repent and not rest satisfied under it."

are forgiven and retained, and that in a general way, corresponding with the general confession.

Against this observe: According to the Scripture each lay member has the *right* to forgive and retain the sins of each individual brother confessing to him; but the minister has also the *office* to do this.

"If the absolution is to be right and effectual, it must proceed from the command of Christ, after this manner: I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of Jesus Christ, and by the power of His command who has bid me say to thee that thy sins are forgiven; so that it is not I, but He Himself who (through my mouth) forgives thy sins, and thou shouldst receive and firmly believe this, not as the word of man, but as if thou hadst heard it from the mouth of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Therefore, although the power to forgive sins belongs to God alone, yet we are to know that He makes use of this power through this external office, to which Christ called His Apostles and commanded them to announce forgiveness of sins in His name to all who desire it. * * * And God Himself does this for our benefit, that we may not look in vain for it to heaven, where we would not receive it, and be compelled to say, Who can ascend to heaven? But that we might be sure of the matter He has placed forgiveness in the public office (of the ministry) and Word, that we may always have it with us, in our very mouth and heart." * * * "Wherefore the voice of the one absolving must be believed not otherwise than we would believe a voice from heaven. And absolution properly can be called a sacrament of repentance." (Jacobs' ed., p. 183.)

"No one," says Luther, "knows the power of private confession except he who must often fight and contend with the devil. * * * If a thousand worlds, twice told, were mine, I would rather lose all than suffer the Church to be deprived of the smallest part of confession and absolution."

VIII. Of the Church.

1. Besides the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, a certain church discipline is also an essential mark of the true Church. (Especially according to the Scotch Confession.)

Against this observe: Church discipline, however wholesome in itself, is an external matter, which the Church, especially in time of oppression, may not always order as she would, and it may, therefore, not be set up as a third essential mark of the Church, besides the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. Therefore, the Lutheran Confession rejects as an error the proposition that there is no true Church where "the public ban and a certain solemn form of excommunication" are not found.

2. Hypocrites belong to the Church in no sense whatever.

Against this observe: In a certain sense they do. They also have been received into communion with the Church by holy Baptism; so long, therefore, as they are allowed to remain in this communion, they must be regarded as *dead members* of the Church, entitled to all churchly rights, *abusing* them, it is true, to their own destruction. The hypocrite within the Christian Church is a Christian by profession only. So much the worse for him!

Concluding Remark.

When we take a survey of the distinctive doctrines of the Romish, Lutheran and Reformed Churches as thus far given, we have reason to rejoice heartily that quite a number of differences noticed in the second part of this book as compared with the first have dis-

appeared. The Reformed Confession shares with us the deep consciousness of the guilt of sin, it recognizes that grace alone brings deliverance, it confesses the doctrine of the justification of the sinner through faith alone and speaks in no doubtful manner of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Truly, these are glorious fruits in our neighbor's garden, which may well cause us to rejoice. But, in the midst of this joy we must not shut our eyes to the fact that there are still many grave differences which separate us from this communion: The doctrine of Predestination, the different conception of the Means of Grace, the doctrine of the Person of Christ, the one-sided manner in which they exaggerate the authority of Scripture * * * and yet fail to do justice to it. When we attempt to trace these various branches of doctrine back to their root—foreign to us—we very naturally think first of the doctrine of Predestination. But the peculiar differences between the Reformed and us still remain, even when, as has been generally done, the doctrine of Predestination is abandoned. The root will be found rather in their peculiar conception of the relation of God to the creature. God is primarily the Lord, man His servant; obedience is the first duty of the Christian; the Lord is always far above this world. We prefer to think of the relation of man to God as that of the dear child to its dear father. We need only compare the life of Calvin, in which everything is conditioned by obedience toward God, who demanded obedience in everything, made laws for everything, with Luther's manner of life and thought. We

do not close our eyes to the grand achievements of the Reformed, especially in the department of practical ethics, which have grown out of that radical idea. Still we prefer to follow the grander, the free trait of Luther. The view referred to will serve to explain the difference between the Reformed and Lutheran systems. As in the Person of Christ and in the Means of Grace the divine and human are by them strictly separated, so too God and man are by them made to stand over against each other in the strict ordering of moral life and of divine worship. — For the better understanding of the subject we add here a few general characteristics.

The general character of Reformed doctrine and practice is:

1. *Spiritualistic.*

The house and worship of God are altogether naked and bare. Sacred pictures and music, and sacred art in general, are disregarded to a greater or less extent. They do not venture to enclose the eternal in temporal forms.

2. *Diffusive and separatistic.*

Here too the reason is that the earthly cannot be the bearer of the heavenly, Baptism and the Lord's Supper are preponderatingly figurative (VI, 1), the communication of divine attributes to the human nature in Christ is a mere figure of speech (II, 2). So too the Word and Spirit are torn asunder (III, 2. *Remark*), likewise the visible element and heavenly gift in Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the divine and hu-

man nature in Christ are not always one and undivided (II, 1); the divine attributes are arbitrarily separated from each other (III, 1).

3. *Legalistic.*

We always find this thought in the foreground, that the Lord's commands must be fulfilled. The New Testament is regarded, more or less, as the law which Christ the King has given to His people; and here and there they cannot rid themselves of the binding force of the Mosaic Sabbath law.

4. *Rationalizing, and yet again emotional.*

The heart does not like to rest in a mystery, the understanding would fathom it, and if it cannot, as much as possible is stricken out, as in the case of the Lord's Supper, or the knot of doubt is cut, as in the doctrine of Predestination. — At the same time little is known of an unemotional faith; the hope of salvation is built less upon the unchangeable word of God than upon the changeable feeling of the heart; for how otherwise shall the elect become sure of his election, if not through his own feeling? And this (*i. e.* feeling) alone, according to the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, can determine whether anything has been received in the Lord's Supper or not; yea, the Zwinglian presentation of the Lord's Supper as a mere feast of remembrance, makes the whole celebration a matter of human emotion.

5. *Unhistorical.*

If possible they would strike out everything which has been developed, and every custom which has

arisen in the Church during 1800 years. The object seems to be to fulfill the King's commands literally, as they have been given, and strike out everything else. Hence the most hostile attitude assumed towards the Romish Church from the beginning, and the disposition to reduce everything in the Church to the measure of the Apostolic times; *i. e.* to drop and abolish everything which has not an express example in the Apostolic Church.

(THE Evangelical Lutheran Church occupies a position intermediate between the doctrine and practice of the Romish and Reformed: in her, spirit and body, external and internal, divine and human, past and present, are united in the most intimate manner. *The Evangelical Lutheran Confession is, therefore, the true Union Confession.* — *From Old Edition.*)

Appendix I.

The Church of England.

Among all the Reformed Church communions *the English Episcopal Church* at present occupies the most important position, and this on the one hand, because the State with which she is in the most intimate connection wields great influence in almost all countries, especially on account of its colonies; on the other hand, on account of her Evangelical activity in the work of missions and for the spread of the Bible. It

is therefore certainly in place that we look yet especially at her peculiarities.

Her Confession (consisting of the 39 Articles) is by far the most moderate of all the Reformed. It presents only one side of the doctrine of *Predestination*, namely, in regard to those who are to be saved, and without expressly saying that herein no regard is to be had to the conduct of man; secondly, the *elements* of the *sacrament* are, in general, called, not only *seals*, but *effective* signs;¹ but their real effect, as far as baptism is concerned, is afterwards restricted to this, that the person baptized is incorporated with the Church,² and as regards the Lord's Supper, to this, that to the worthy communicants (not however to the unworthy) the bread becomes a communion (not more closely defined) with the body of Christ.³ The English Episcopal Church also proves herself to be the most mod-

¹The English (Episcopal) Catechism directly calls the elements of the sacrament *means* through which we obtain the grace represented by them; but it still remains uncertain whether we are to understand this as meaning that they are really the bearers of the invisible grace, or only so much, that the latter is imparted to us during their use.

²It is true, the usual forms for Baptism and Confirmation speak of a regeneration through water and the Holy Ghost. But since this is an adoption of Scripture words, without any definite dogmatical idea attached to it, it remains uncertain whether we are to understand that the water is really the mediating cause of regeneration, or only that the latter takes place during the use of the former.

³The liturgy insists positively upon the total absence of the body and blood of Christ, as being locally confined.

erate of all the Reformed, in that she has retained many non-essentials of the Catholic Church, such as days commemorative of the Apostles, etc. Indeed, during the past thirty years a strong Romanizing tendency is making itself felt. At present this tendency (of the so-called Ritualists) is directed to the restoration of the Catholic order of worship through the re-introduction of crucifixes, candles, holy water, frankincense, chasubels, choir boys and mass bells. In connection with this a very critical uncertainty in matters of doctrine is manifesting itself; as, for example, in the recognition of tradition, to be sure, only of the first centuries, of prayers for the dead, of an inclination towards the Romish view of the sacraments, as also of the invocation of saints, of Mary, etc. In these things they certainly transcend the sphere of things indifferent. But in regard to the importance to be attached to *organization*, she is inclined to go beyond the true Evangelical standard, especially by attaching so much authority to *the office of bishops* (who, certainly originally, and for a long time, differed in no respect, as regards their office, from presbyters or elders); so that she allows neither a deacon nor a priest,⁴ *but only the bishop*, to confirm, ordain and dedicate (churches, cemeteries, etc.). In this Episcopal prerogative they generally delight also to see something more than mere human order. Nay, the Puseyites, a by no means insignificant party, directly regard

⁴Bishop, priest and deacon; these are the three spiritual degrees which they strictly distinguish from each other.

the uninterrupted succession of bishops as something essential. There also attaches to her — as indeed to most of the Reformed Church communions — something of the Old Testament legalism, especially as regards the observance of Sunday, which, regardless of the passage Colossians 2, 16, they not only love to call Sabbath, but also, consistently therewith, and after the manner of the Jews, hedge about with all kinds of external commands and prohibitions, and seek to distinguish it also from other festivals, by regarding the celebration of these as unimportant compared with that of Sunday. To this must be added that she, not only by way of abuse, but in her Confession, grants so much authority to *human government*,⁵ that in the 21st Article it is directly said: "General Councils may not be convened without the commandment and will of princes"; and in general makes the superiority of the King of England in external church affairs an article of religion.

Remark: The Scotch, as distinguished from the Episcopal Church, is called Presbyterian, and rejects the Episcopal organization of the English Church, recognizing (according to the Scripture) no essential difference between presbyters (elders) and bishops. In 1843 the so-called "*Free Church*" separated from her (the Scotch) on the fixed principle, that a State Church government is in no case consistent with the idea of a Christian Church. The occasion for this was the refusal, on the part of the patrons, to allow the congregations to have any voice in the selection of their ministers. Although in 1874 the right of patrons was generally abolished

⁵Of course the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States does not lay herself open to this charge. D. M. M.

throughout Scotland, yet the General Assembly of the Free Church rejected a proposition to reunite with the State Church.

Appendix II.

Concerning the Union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches.

Already in the days of the Reformation an effort was made to effect a union between the Reformed and Lutherans, thinking, as some did, that the differences consisted in matters of little importance which might easily be compromised. The attempt was frustrated by Luther's firm opposition (at Marburg, 1529): *You have another spirit!* And thus, as history shows, it must remain, however ready we may be to recognize the truly and genuinely Evangelical features in the doctrine and life of the Reformed Church.

What failed then and later on has been accomplished — with apparent success — in our century. The pious king, Frederick William III. of Prussia, in the year 1817 resolved to unite the two churches. The times seemed to favor the royal wish. The theologians, who at that time were almost all Rationalists, regarded the "Distinctive Doctrines" with indifference. True, at that time, a new spirit of religious enthusiasm was sensibly felt everywhere in German lands, but still was able primarily to call forth no more than a general religious feeling, and only here and there a genuine churchly spirit. They

felt themselves a "Nation of Brethren," and therefore rejoiced in the thought of "one revived Evangelical Church." Hence the wish of the king at first seemed to find favor everywhere. The Palatinate of the Rhine, Baden, Hesse-Darmstadt, Waldeck, the principalities of Anhalt and Dessau soon followed the example of Prussia. But the powerful movement of those times soon called forth another consciousness; to wit, the true historic conception of the past, especially the appreciation of, and reverence for, the religious heritage of the fathers with its glorious treasures. Thus there was no lack of spirited and energetic resistance to the aim at union. Who can doubt that it was justified? In the sphere of religious conviction all commands and ordinances are evils, they may come whence they will. Breslau, as is well known, became the center of resistance to the Union. It is equally well known that an attempt was made to crush it by friendly and by forcible means. All was in vain. Touching evidences of faithfulness to the Confessions were witnessed in those days. They go far to prove the great truth that religious conviction is stronger than all the expedients of the world. The assertion that the Union was not intended to represent the relinquishing of former Confessions of faith, but only "the spirit of clemency and moderation" (1834), was also in vain. Peace was not secured until the time of King Frederick William IV. The Lutherans offering resistance were recognized as a separate Lutheran Church-communion in the year 1845 and were allowed their own church government. But

in the Prussian State Church also a powerful Lutheran element made itself felt, seeking to preserve intact the heritage of the fathers in doctrine, cultus, the constitution and government of congregations. Nor have these efforts been in vain.

Through all this became manifest the inner impossibility of a real union of the two communions. The Union has missed its aim. It did not bring about a real unity; those who were really alive religiously became more and more what they were: Lutherans or Reformed. Nay, the Union effected the very opposite of what was intended. King Frederick III. said: "It is very unpleasant that the good work of union has led to discord." And it was really so. It was due to the Union that the old controversy about the Confessions was again renewed in its old harshness, and was conducted on this side and on that, often in a spirit void of gentleness and love; in former years, at least, the Union often became the dividing line between the Lutherans of Prussia and other Lutherans; finally the Union, although the outgrowth of believing sentiment, was often forced to stand as the banner of a feeble and half-way faith. Thus it missed its aim.

But if we are told that to-day everything is in proper order, inasmuch as the Union is intended to consist for the most part only in oneness of church government and matters of cultus, we must refer to the 7th Article of the Augsburg Confession. There it is said: "Unto the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gos-

pel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted of men, should be alike everywhere; as St. Paul says: 'There is one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all' (Eph. 4, 4. 5)." This shows plainly that according to the Confession of our Church agreement in doctrine belongs to the unity of the Church, but that a common form of service, of Church government and the like, are not necessary to it nor can they bring it about.

But let us not forget the true union on account of the false — because impossible — union. The true union will consist in love and regard for the brethren who are heartily devoted to the Gospel and faithful to their confession in the common battle against all the powers of unbelief and destruction in our time, and in the common effort for the alleviation of suffering and distress among our people.

As for the rest, in order to be just to the Lutheran brethren who live in the Union, we will not forget that great and dreaded dangers, that one-sidedness and bitterness threaten those religious communities separating from the National Church.

Finally we propose to speak more fully than could be done hitherto about the most important doctrinal differences between the Lutherans and Reformed, and in doing so we shall refer especially to the elaborations of our latest confessional writing, the Formula of Concord, on these points.

The opinion is very common now, that the doctrine of the justification of a penitent, believing sinner

for the sake of the merits of Christ alone is the only essential doctrine of the Scriptures. That it is the principal doctrine cannot be denied, as we have already seen (p. 45). But as in a building the chief beam needs the support of side-beams, so too along with this leading thought there are many and manifold concurrent thoughts. We may undoubtedly call it the central point, but in the end all Scripture doctrine must serve to place this blessed central doctrine of our salvation in its proper light (so, for instance, the doctrine of the total depravity of man) and to call and lead the deceitful and desperately wicked human heart up to, and into, it (as, for instance, the doctrine of the last things, of death, the resurrection, judgment and eternal life). The two most important doctrines in this connection are undoubtedly the doctrines of the person of Christ as the God-man, and of the Means of Grace, the Word, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The former furnishes, if we may say so, the very two pillars needed for the support of this most saving article of justification through the merit of Christ alone, for only that Man who was at the same time God could place Himself as Mediator between God and men, satisfy the justice of God in man's stead, and thus effect justification for sinful men; and just because justification by faith rests upon this doctrine, as upon two pillars, St. John also says, on the one hand: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," *i. e.* has become true man, "is of God," and on the other hand: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in

him, and he in God" (1 John 4, 2. 15). — But just as the doctrine of the person of Christ as true God and true Man furnishes the two needed pillars for the article of justification alone through the merits of Christ, so the doctrine of the Means of Grace shows us the three true channels through which the saving stream of the merits of Christ, out of whose fulness we are to receive grace for grace, is to flow to us. But if we follow up this matter consistently, we must arrive at the conclusion that the Reformed doctrine

1) Stands opposed to this very central doctrine, namely the article of justification *through faith*, and involves it in doubt by the doctrine of the unconditional decree, according to which God, without regard to faith or unbelief on the part of men, did from eternity elect some to eternal life and ordain some to eternal damnation. The fact that we rarely find the practical application of this does not change the matter, for it is not the proper thing only then to cover the cistern when the child has already fallen into it;

2) That the Reformed doctrine attacks the two pillars upon which the doctrine of justification rests, viz: the two natures in Christ; by the assertion that no real communication of attributes takes place these are separated in such a manner that only the human nature suffered, and only the divine nature is present; both of which trespass upon the high-priestly and royal office of our Lord, according to which He purchased justification for us on the cross and would now communicate it to us from the throne of the Majesty, for if, on the one hand, His divine nature had

no part in His sufferings, His shed blood was not the blood of "the Son of God," and hence does not avail for our justification; and if, on the other hand, His human nature is included in heaven, we are deprived of the joyfulness of going to Him in prayer and receiving grace for grace from His fulness, for then we have indeed always the holy, almighty Judge about us, before whose eyes everything is naked and open, but not at the same time the merciful High-priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities (Hebrews 4, 13-16);

3) That, finally, the Reformed doctrine attacks also our conception of the Means of Grace, the Word, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, threatening to destroy their effectiveness by representing that the former is only a guide and the two latter are only types and shadows devoid of their saving substance, so that man must depend upon his own heart and judge the certainty of his salvation by the feeling of his heart. But to depend upon the feeling of one's own heart is a dangerous thing, especially at the time of great temptation, when all sensation of grace vanishes from the heart and Satan also aims his fiery darts at us. Woe unto us if such temptation does not teach us to give heed to the Word as to the only rock in the restless ocean of human sentimentality; woe to all who cannot say in truth: "And though my heart but no should say, Thy Word shall be a surer stay!" (1 John 3, 20). From this alone already we can see the importance of the pure doctrine with reference to those points in which the Lutheran Confession differs from

the Reformed in its application to Christian life. The following remarks however will make this still plainer.

1. Of the Pure Doctrine Concerning the Eternal Election of God.

(From the Formula of Concord.)

The doctrine concerning this article, if presented from, and according to, the pattern of the divine Word [and analogy of God's Word and of faith], neither can nor should be regarded as useless or unnecessary, much less as causing offense or injury, because the Holy Scriptures not only in but one place and incidentally, but in many places, thoroughly discuss and urge [explain] the same. Therefore, on account of abuse or misunderstanding we should not neglect or reject the doctrine of the divine Word, but precisely on that account, in order to avert all abuse and misunderstanding, the true meaning should and must be explained from the foundation of the Scriptures. (Jacobs' ed., pp. 649, 650.) This eternal election or appointment of God to eternal life is also not to be considered merely in God's secret, inscrutable counsel in such a manner as though it comprised in itself nothing further, or nothing more belonged thereto, and nothing more were to be considered therein, than that God foresaw who and how many would be saved, and who and how many would be damned, or that He only held a review, and would say thus: "This one shall be saved, that one shall be damned; this one shall remain steadfast [in faith to the end], that one shall not remain steadfast." For

from this many derive and adopt strange, dangerous and pernicious thoughts, which occasion and strengthen either security and impenitence or despondency and despair, so that they fall into troublesome thoughts and [for thus some think, with peril to themselves, nay, even sometimes] speak thus: Since "before the foundation of the world was laid" (Eph. 1, 4) "God has foreknown [predestinated] His elect for salvation, and God's foreknowledge cannot err or be injured or changed by any one" (Isa. 14, 27; Rom. 9, 19), "if I, then, am foreknown [elected] for salvation, nothing can injure me with respect to it, even though, without repentance, I practice all sorts of sin and shame, do not regard the Word and sacraments, concern myself neither with repentance, faith, prayer nor godliness. But I nevertheless will and must be saved; because God's foreknowledge [election] must come to pass. If, however, I am not foreknown [predestinated], it nevertheless helps me nothing, even though I would observe the Word, repent, believe, etc.; for I cannot hinder or change God's foreknowledge [predestination]." And such thoughts occur indeed even to godly hearts, although, by God's grace, they have repentance, faith and a good purpose [of living in a godly manner], so that they think: "If you are not foreknown [predestinated or elected] from eternity for salvation, everything [your every effort and entire labor] is of no avail." This especially occurs when they regard their weakness and the examples of those who have not persevered [in faith to the end], but have fallen away again [from true god-

liness to ungodliness, and have become apostates]. Against this false delusion and such dangerous thoughts we should establish the following firm foundation, which is sure and cannot fail, namely: Since all Scripture has been given by God, not for [cherishing] security and impenitence, but should serve "for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3, 16); also, since everything in God's Word has been prescribed to us, not that we should thereby be driven to despair, but "that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope" (Rom. 15, 4); it is without doubt in no way the sound sense or right use of the doctrine concerning the eternal foreknowledge of God that thereby either impenitence or despair should be occasioned or strengthened. Therefore the Scriptures present to us this doctrine in no other way than to direct us thereby to the [revealed] Word (Eph. 1, 13; 1 Cor. 1, 7), exhort to repentance (2 Tim. 3, 16), urge to godliness (Eph. 1, 14; John 15, 3), strengthen faith and assure us of our salvation (Eph. 1, 13; John 10, 27 sq.; 2 Thess. 2, 13 sq.). (Jacobs' ed., pp. 651, 652.) And of this we should not judge according to our reason, also not according to the Law or from any external appearance. Neither should we attempt to investigate the secret, concealed abyss of divine predestination, but should give heed to the revealed will of God. For He has "made known unto us the mystery of His will," and made it manifest through Christ that it might be preached (Eph. 1, 9 sqq.; 2 Tim. 1, 9 sq.). (Jacobs' ed., p. 653.)—Thus far is the

mystery of predestination revealed to us in God's Word, and if we abide thereby and cleave thereto, it is a very useful, salutary, consolatory doctrine; for it establishes very effectually the article that we are justified and saved without all works and merits of ours, purely out of grace, alone for Christ's sake. For before the ages of the world, before we were born, yea, before the foundation of the world was laid, when we indeed could do nothing good, we were according to God's purpose chosen out of grace in Christ to salvation (Rom. 9, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9). All opinions and erroneous doctrines concerning the powers of our natural will are thereby overthrown, because God in His counsel, before the ages of the world, decided and ordained that He Himself, by the power of His Holy Ghost, would produce and work in us, through the Word, everything that pertains to our conversion. Therefore this doctrine affords also the excellent, glorious consolation that God was so solicitous concerning the conversion, righteousness and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully provided therefor, that before the foundation of the world was laid He deliberated concerning it, and in His [secret] purpose ordained how He would bring me thereto [call and lead me to salvation] and preserve me therein. Also, that He wished to secure my salvation so well and certainly that since, through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, it could easily be lost from our hands, or through craft and might of the devil and the world be torn or removed therefrom, in His eternal purpose, which cannot fail or

be overthrown, He ordained it, and placed it for preservation in the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can pluck us (John 10, 28). Hence Paul also says (Rom. 8, 28. 39): "Because we have been called according to the purpose of God, who will separate us from the love of God in Christ?"

Under the cross also and amid temptations this doctrine affords glorious consolation, namely, that God in His counsel, before the time of the world, determined and decreed that He would assist us in all distresses [anxieties and perplexities], grant patience [under the cross], give consolation, excite [nourish and encourage] hope, and produce such a result as would contribute to our salvation * * * This article also affords a glorious testimony that the Church of God will abide against all the gates of hell, and likewise teaches what is the true Church of God, so that we may not be offended by the great authority [and majestic appearance] of the false Church (Rom. 9, 24. 25).

From this article also powerful admonitions and warnings are derived, as (Luke 7, 30): "They rejected the counsel of God against themselves." Luke 14, 24: "I say unto you that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper." Also (Matt. 20, 16): "Many be called but few chosen." Also (Luke 8, 8. 18): "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and: "Take heed how ye hear." Thus the doctrine concerning this article can be employed with profit

for consolation, and so as to contribute to salvation. (Jacobs' ed., pp. 657, 658.)

When we proceed thus far in this article we remain upon the right [safe and royal] way, as it is written (Hos. 13, 9): "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help." But with respect to that in this disputation which will proceed too high and beyond these limits, we should, with Paul, place the finger upon our lips, and remember and say (Rom. 9, 20): "O man, who art thou, that repliest against God?" For that in this article we neither can nor should inquire after and investigate everything, the great apostle Paul declares [by his own example]. For when, after having argued much concerning this article from the revealed Word of God, he comes to where he points out what, concerning this mystery, God has reserved for His hidden wisdom, he suppresses and cuts off the discussion with the following words (Rom. 11, 33 sq.): "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord?" *i. e.* in addition to and beyond that which He has revealed in His Word. Therefore this eternal election of God is to be considered in Christ, and not beyond or without Christ. For "in Christ," testifies the apostle Paul (Eph. 1, 4 sq.), "He hath chosen us before the foundation of the world"; as it is written: "He hath made us accepted in the Beloved." * * * For it has been decided by the Father from eternity that whom He would save He

would save through Christ (John 14, 6): "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." And again (John 10, 9): "I am the door; by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved." (Jacobs' ed., pp. 660, 661.)

2. Of the Pure Doctrine Concerning the Word.

(From the Formula of Concord.)

And this call of God, which is made through the preaching of the Word, we should regard as no delusion, but know that thereby God reveals His will, viz. that in those whom He thus calls He will work through the Word, that they may be enlightened, converted and saved. For the Word whereby we are called, is "a ministration of the Spirit," that gives the Spirit, or whereby the Spirit is given (2 Cor. 3, 8), and "a power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1, 16). And since the Holy Ghost wishes to be efficacious through the Word, and to strengthen and give power and ability, it is God's will that we should receive the Word, believe and obey it. (Jacobs' ed., p. 654.)

And in order that we may come to Christ, the Holy Ghost works, through the hearing of the Word, true faith, as the apostle testifies when he says (Rom. 10, 17): "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God," viz. when it is preached in its purity and without adulteration. (Jacobs' ed., p. 661.)

We teach that it is God's command that we believe such absolution, and regard it as sure, when we believe the word of absolution, that we are as truly reconciled to God as though we had heard a voice from

heaven; as the Apology explains this article. This consolation would be entirely taken from us if we were not to infer the will of God towards us from the call which is made through the Word and through the sacraments. There would also be overthrown and taken from us the foundation that the Holy Ghost wishes to be certainly present with the Word preached, heard, considered, and thereby to be efficacious and to work. (Jacobs' ed., p. 656.)

(From Lœche's essay "On the divine Word as the Light which leads to Peace.")

Now when a soul is awakened and begins to inquire earnestly: "What must I do to be saved?" the answer is very properly given: "Seek Jesus and His light, all else will help thee nothing." But as a rule there is very poor advice given as to where to seek Christ. For the most part the inquirer is told to seek the Lord on his knees, to call upon Him in the spirit of longing and desire, and He will not fail to appear — in His own time, at the appointed hour. The poor souls now try everything; they cry, they call upon the Almighty and will not leave Him except He bless them; and the omnipresent One, who hears the cry even of the young ravens, blesses them also with a gracious sense of His presence. Full of joy the awakened inquirer arises from his knees and believes — believes that he has now found his Savior; his trembling heart would gladly die, like Simeon, for he has seen the salvation of God. — But, alas, this is all transitory; such seasons are often given to the child, to the young man, in Christ; but the older one grows as a Chris-

tian, the more seldom is one favored with such emotions of joy; and if one has measured his Christianity by them it falls to the ground and is replaced by a gloomy longing for that which is behind, is changed into a pitiful pillar of salt, like Lot's wife, who looked back, and in doing so failed to reach Zoar, the quiet haven of rest, which lay before her.

Hence when any one is awakened it should be our first care to tell him not to regard the excitement of his mind, and the joy which he may possibly experience (for not every awakening is characterized by strong—whether sweet or bitter—emotions) as the permanent and chief thing in this matter; that he should rejoice as though not rejoicing, not place so much stress upon his feelings, that in their absence the foundation pillars would be shaken; much rather should he—and this we advise above all else—from the beginning to the end of his spiritual life, look, not to that within himself, which is always changeable, but to the unchangeable promises of the Word of God, which, thanks be to God! are outside of us, are not affected by our feelings, are a divine pledge and assurance, nay a deed and charter for redeemed souls. Yes, we should teach awakened Christians to regard these promises as being far greater and more important than their faith.

As much higher as God is than man, so much higher is God's Word and promise than our faith. By so much as our salvation depends upon God more than upon us, by so much also it is more important that God's Word should not fail than that our faith

should not fail. Faith is little and great; God's Word is always the same. God's Word is His faithfulness and mercy revealed; God's Word is His gracious or wrathful presence, according as each one chooses; — where God's Word and promise are, there too are His gracious and life-giving powers.

If therefore any one is awakened, we should certainly give him the advice: "Seek Jesus and His light, all else will help thee nothing." But direct him to God's Word, the Holy Scriptures, and tell him: "These are they which testify of Him!" Do not tell him to begin by asking on his knees for divine revelation, but gratefully and gladly to accept the already existing revelation and manifestation of God which we have in His Word. Show him by plain, forcible passages from the Holy Scriptures who Jesus is, what His office and work are, how great His faithfulness; then tell him, with the authority and confidence of a redeemed child of God, as His messenger: "Now you know Him, He is present everywhere, especially where His Word is, where His name is recorded; He loves those who do not seek Him, why not those who do seek Him? — How dare you contradict His promises for the sake of deceitful and desperately wicked hearts? Do you think that His heart is like yours? No, no, His is mercy and faithfulness; you are unmerciful and unfaithful to Him. He knows it, He knows you. Trust His Word, do not begin to doubt it; everything else may slip away from you; yes, let happen what will with everything else: His promise will not fail thee. In the world you have tribulation —

what does it matter? With Him, in His promises, you have peace.”—When we have thus driven souls into such straits (Boos’s autobiography furnishes striking examples) that they must yield and submit to being saved by the Word, we should thenceforth not trust in human devices, not in our praying and watching, in fact in no efforts of our own; no, let the same means which brought these souls to Jesus, and taught them to know Him, keep them in communion with Him, viz. a firm, unwavering faith in God’s Word and promise. No matter into what temptations, errors or feelings one may be led, let him always hold fast to the difference between God and men, God’s Word and human feeling, God’s faithfulness and man’s faith, and thus always return to that implicit though insensible faith which clings alone to the Word—to the narrow way on which Thomas walked, viz. to believe though we do not see; let us praise and magnify the name of Him who keepeth Israel, who neither slumbers nor sleeps, who knows all troubled souls and their distress, and therefore has revealed to them such glorious, affecting words concerning His covenant of peace which cannot be overthrown, in order that they, encompassed on all sides by dogs and untamed monsters, may always have that unerring light for their feet, His promises, which, like the sun, arise, but together with the healing on their wings, never set. In this way we furnish souls with an objective point beyond the world, whence these are lifted out of their hinges and the body is transformed into thoughts of peace; thus

we secure hearts that are gentle, but fixed, and that endure patiently in the warfare of life. He who exercises himself in this blind (and yet how bright!) confidence in the Word learns to understand the fight of faith; he embraces not only the Word, but in the Word the Lord Himself, who is called a Rock, and thus he himself gradually assumes the nature of a rock, that cannot by the strength of any misfortune be uprooted or moved from its foundation. Let us show troubled souls everywhere and in every instance, that all want vanishes, that all sins are forgiven as soon as we turn again with implicit trust to the Word of the cross, nay, that all misery and all sins are due only to this, viz. that we depart again and again from the unfelt faith and trust in God's promises.

Let us not compromise the Scriptures in any respect, let us not submit to any man however correct his utterances may be, in order that the people may look, not to men who are unreliable and must soon pass away, but to God alone, and learn to derive comfort from His Word. If any be tormented with doubts, let us not try to remove them with proofs founded upon reason, for the one so troubled cannot see that doubts have their origin, not in reason, but in unreason and folly; he imagines that it is quite reasonable for him to doubt. Hold up before the doubter a declaration of God's Word, never for a moment relinquishing the position that this is far above all doubts. Such implicit trust and firm faith on the part of a pastor will dispel doubts and revive confidence where it has fallen asleep. Reason which

rises up against God is driven from the field by that free and bold contempt of reason which makes God's Word its boast. — If any one sincerely repents, pronounce the absolution of the Lord with divine authority and assure him that the absolution is greater and mightier than all the sins of the world. If any tremble in the hour of death, begin a prayer of thanksgiving to Him in whose Holy Scriptures every third word speaks of eternal life, and magnify to the dying one the great certainty of the divine promise, compared with which Death himself is a shameful liar. If any one be tempted by Satan's craft and power, we know what sword to place in his hand. If any one would clear and justify himself, show him the judgment which God has pronounced upon all men in His Word, and how the judgment of God puts to naught all the illusions of men. If any one would sin, show him God's love and warnings, wrath and curses as expressed in His Word — what can we do more?

Thus Christ met His enemies — the serpent and the seed of the serpent and overcame them every time — until He cried out: "It is finished!" Thus Luther in the name of God overthrew the pope's glory and all his lies. Thus each one can for himself gain the victory. Only let us under all circumstances, at all times, in word and life, stand by the Word of God: this is the best, most pointed, most tranquil, most conscientious Protestantism. For without the foundation of the divine Word faith soars in the air and in the mist, is a dream and a fancy.

3. Of the Pure Doctrine Concerning Baptism.

(Luther's Large Catechism.)

It is of the greatest importance that we esteem Baptism excellent, glorious and exalted, for which we chiefly contend and fight, because the world is now so full of sects exclaiming that Baptism is a merely external thing, and that external things are of no use. But let it be ever so much an external thing, here stand God's Word and commandment which have instituted, established and confirmed Baptism. But what God has instituted and commanded cannot be a vain, useless thing, but must be most precious, though in external appearance it be of less value than a straw. (Jacobs' ed., p. 466.)

From this now derive a proper understanding of the subject, and when asked what Baptism is, answer, that it is not simply water, but water comprehended in God's Word and commandment, and sanctified thereby, so that it is nothing else than a divine water; not that the water in itself is better than other water, but that God's Word and commandment are added. Therefore it is pure wickedness and blasphemy of the devil that now our new spirits mock at Baptism, separate it from God's Word and institution, and regard nothing but the water which is taken from the well; and then they prate and say: How is a handful of water to save souls? Yes indeed, my friend, who does not know as much as that, that if they be separated from one another water is water? But how dare you thus interfere with God's order, and tear out the most precious jewel with which God has con-

nected it and set it, and which He will not have separated? For the germ in the water is God's Word and commandment and the name of God, which is a treasure greater and nobler than heaven and earth.

Thus we now comprehend the difference, that Baptism is quite another thing from all other water; not on account of the natural water, but because something more noble is here added. For God Himself stakes His honor, His power and might thereon. Therefore it is not simply natural water, but a divine, heavenly, holy and blessed water, and in whatever other terms we can praise it, — all on account of the Word, which is a heavenly, holy Word, that no one can sufficiently extol, for it has and is able to do all that God is and can do [since it has all the virtue and power of God comprised in it]. Hence also it derives its character as a sacrament, as St. Augustine also taught: "*Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.*" That is, when the Word is joined to the element or natural substance it becomes a sacrament, that is, something holy and divine, and a holy and divine sign.

Therefore we always teach that the sacraments and all external things which God has ordained and instituted should not be regarded according to the coarse, external mask, as we regard the shell of a nut, but as the Word of God is included therein. For thus we also speak of the parental estate and of civil government. If we would regard the persons in such estate, according to their noses, eyes, skin, and hair, flesh and bones, we should find them to look like

Turks and heathen. And you might well proceed to say: Why should I esteem them more than others? But because the commandment of God is added: "*Honor thy father and thy mother,*" I see quite another man, adorned and clothed with the majesty and glory of God. The commandment (I say) is the chain of gold about his neck, yea, the crown upon his head, which shows to me how and why I shall honor this flesh and blood.

Thus, and much more even, we must honor Baptism, and esteem it glorious, on account of the Word, as being honored both in word and deed by God Himself, and confirmed with miracles from heaven. For do you think it was a jest that when Christ was baptized the heavens opened and the Holy Ghost descended visibly, and there was nothing present but divine glory and majesty? Therefore I exhort again that these two, the water and the Word, be by no means separated. For if the Word be taken away, the water is the same as that with which the servant cooks, and may indeed be called a bath-keeper's baptism. But when the Word is added, as God has ordained, it is a sacrament, and is called Christian Baptism. (Jacobs' ed., pp. 467, 468.)

But as our would-be wise, new spirits declare that faith alone saves, and that works and everything external avail nothing, we answer: It is true, nothing in us is in any way effectual but faith, as we shall hear still further. But this these blind guides are unwilling to see, viz. that faith must have something which it is to believe, something of which it may take

hold, and upon which it can stand and rest. Thus faith clings to the water, and believes that in Baptism is pure salvation and life; not in the water (as we have said plainly enough), but in the Word and institution of God incorporated therein, and the name of God which inheres in it. If I believe this, what else is that but believing in God as in Him who has given and set His Word in this ordinance, and proposes to us this external element wherein we may apprehend such a treasure. We therefore say that it is madness to separate faith, and that wherein faith adheres and to which it is bound, though it be something external. Yea, it must be something external that it may be apprehended by the senses, comprehended, and thereby be brought into the heart, as indeed the entire Gospel is an external, verbal proclamation. (Jacobs' ed., p. 469.)

Therefore every Christian has enough in Baptism to learn and to practice all his life. For he has always enough to do to believe firmly what Baptism promises and brings, viz. victory over death and the devil, forgiveness of sin, the grace of God, the entire Christ and the Holy Ghost with His gifts. In short, it is so transcendent that if timid nature consider it, it might well doubt whether it could be true. For only consider, if there were somewhere a physician who understood the art of saving men from dying, or, if they died, of restoring them to life, so that they would live forever, how the world would pour in money like snow and rain, so that because of the throng of the rich no one could find access! But

here in Baptism there is brought free to every one's door such a treasure and such medicine as utterly destroys death and preserves all men alive.

We must so regard Baptism and avail ourselves of its blessings, that when our sins and conscience oppress us we strengthen ourselves and take comfort and say: I am baptized, and if baptized it is promised me that I shall be saved and have eternal life, both in soul and body. (Jacobs' ed., p. 471.)

4. Concerning the Pure Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

(Sartorius "On Holy Love.")

As St. John (1 John 4, 8) so truly says: He that loveth not knoweth not God, so we may also say of the Lord's Supper: He that loveth not knoweth it not. It is, as remarked above, the littleness of faith in the greatness of divine love which ignores and disparages the mysteries of the Christian religion, which are so great just because so full of love. Just as everything which disparages the divine exaltation of the person of Christ or the depth of His condescension and drags down the ever-present Christ to one absent and belonging to the past, is a disparagement of divine love, so too everything that deprives the Lord's Supper of that which it contains and imparts and, denying that it is what it really is, makes of it only a mere type. True, even that already is a mark of love, if any one gives another an image or likeness of himself as a memento; but how small when compared with this, that one gives his present self to another as a bond of love and friendship. If

Christ, in departing from His disciples, as to His visible presence, had left them, in His testament before His death, only a type, a shadow, how immeasurably much would not only His first disciples, who had stood in direct, in the closest, communion with Him, have lost by His going away from them, but much more yet all later disciples of later times, all of whom would be directed to a shadow instead of the substance, although just in the New Testament the shadows of the good things to come were to give place to the substance thereof and a perpetual, real communion with the true High Priest and His sacrifice was to be instituted (Heb. 10, 1). It was these that Christ wanted to provide for in the night in which He was betrayed by instituting for all following generations of Christendom, for the whole future of His Church, until He comes again, the holy sacrament of the communion of His body and blood. Besides, if indeed bread and wine are only a type and image of that Christ who has vanished from His Church, how poorly typical would they be as such, how far short would they fall of a picture of Christ as compared with a crucifix; and how unbecoming it would be to consume these typical tokens of remembrance right after receiving them, instead of keeping them framed, under glass, as in the case of a monstrance, for a perpetual memorial. There is a remarkable contradiction in this, that the very persons who laid so much stress on the prohibition: Thou shalt not make unto thee any image or likeness, also so strongly insisted

on making bread and wine a mere type and image of the body and blood of Christ.

(Luther's "Large Confession Concerning the Lord's Supper.")

Behold, what a fine, great, wonderful thing it is, how well it all fits together, and is essentially a sacrament. The words are the chief thing, for without the words the cup and the bread would be nothing. Further, without the bread and cup the body and blood of Christ would not be there. Without the body and blood of Christ the New Testament would not be there. Without the New Testament there would be no forgiveness of sins there. Without the forgiveness of sins life and salvation would not be there. So then, in the first place, the words comprise the bread and the cup for the sacrament, the bread and the cup comprise the body and blood of Christ, the body and blood of Christ comprise the New Testament. The New Testament comprises the forgiveness of sins, the forgiveness of sins comprises everlasting life and salvation. Behold, all this the words of the Lord's Supper bring and give to us, and we embrace it with faith; should then the devil not be the enemy of such sacrament and employ fanatics against it?

(Luther "That the Words, etc., still stand fast.")

It is true, according to the wisdom of Oekolampadius, Christ has no other honor than that He sits at the right hand of God on a velvet cushion, and lets the angels sing, fiddle, tingle and play for Him, and is unburdened with cares about the Lord's Supper; but according to the faith of us poor sinners and fools

His honor is manifold, that His body and blood are in the Lord's Supper. In the first place this, that thereby He makes the learned and wise fanatics to be fools, and lets them take offense and stumble at His words and works (1 Cor. 1, 23). Now that is indeed a great honor of divine wisdom, and to us who are foolish He is a glorious, praiseworthy God, who can confound the wise with foolish things, and bring their wisdom to shame, so that they must be blind where they would be the very wisest (1 Cor. 1, 27). In the second place this redounds to the honor and praise of His inexpressible grace, that He regards us poor sinners so much and shows us so much love and such great benefits, not being satisfied to be everywhere, in and about us, over and around us, but also gives us His own body for food, to assure and comfort us with such pledge, that our bodies also shall live forever, since here on earth already they partake of eternal and living food. Now we poor fools hold, that this is a reason for honoring any one, when he shows his grace, goodness and favor to others, for that is a miserable honor and not a divine honor when any one seeks for himself the honor and service of others; hence it would be well enough to send the fanatics to school so that they might learn what honor is. * * * Our God's honor is this, that He, for our sakes, deigns to come down into the very depths, into our flesh, into the bread, into our mouth, heart and bosom, and besides this suffers for our sakes, so that He is ill treated, both on the cross and altar, as St. Paul says 1 Cor. 11, 27, that some eat of this bread

unworthily. He suffers continually, that His Word, His work and everything that He has is persecuted, slandered, dishonored and abused before His divine eyes, and still sits in His glory.

5. Concerning the Pure Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

(The Formula of Concord says in Luther's Words.)

"Zwingli calls that an *alloësis* when anything is ascribed to the divinity of Christ which nevertheless belongs to the humanity or the reverse. As Luke 24, 26: 'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?' Here Zwingli triflingly declares that [the word] Christ is understood with respect to the human nature. Beware, beware, I say, of the *alloësis*; for it is a mask of the devil, as it at last forms such a Christ after which I certainly would not be a Christian. For its design is that henceforth Christ should be no more, and do no more with His sufferings and life, than another mere saint. For if I believe [permit myself to be persuaded] that only the human nature has suffered for me, Christ is to me a Savior of little worth, since He indeed Himself stands in need of a Savior. In a word, what the devil seeks by the *alloësis* is inexpressible." — And shortly afterwards: "If the old sorceress, Dame Reason, the grandmother of the *alloësis*, should say, Yea, divinity can neither suffer nor die; you should reply, That is true; yet, because in Christ divinity and humanity are one person, Scripture, on account of this personal union, ascribes also to divinity everything that occurs to the humanity, and the reverse. And

thus, indeed, it is in truth. For this must certainly be said [acknowledged], viz. the person (he refers to Christ) suffers and dies. Now the person is true God; therefore it is rightly said: The Son of God suffers. For although the one part (so to say), viz. the divinity, does not suffer, yet the person, which is God, suffers in the other part, viz. in His humanity; for in truth God's Son has been crucified for us, *i. e.* the person which is God. For the person, the person, I say, was crucified according to the humanity." And again shortly afterwards: "If the *alloësis* exist, as Zwingli proposes, it will be necessary for Christ to have two persons, one divine and one human, because Zwingli applies the passages concerning suffering, alone to the human nature, and of course diverts them from the divinity. For if the works be parted and dis-united, the person must also be divided, since all the works or sufferings are ascribed, not to the natures, but to the person. For it is the person that does and suffers everything, one thing according to one nature, and another according to the other nature, all of which the learned know well. Therefore we consider our Lord Christ as God and man in one person, so that we neither confound the natures nor divide the person."

Dr. Luther says also in his book, "Of the Councils and the Church": "We Christians must know that if God were not in the [one] balance and gave it weight, we would sink to the ground with our scale of the balance. By this I mean: If it were not said [if these things were not true], 'God has died for us,' but only

a man, we are lost. But if the death of God, and that God died, lie in the scale of the balance, He sinks down, and we rise up as a light, empty scale. But He also can indeed rise again or spring from the scale; yet He could not have descended into the scale unless He had first become a man like us, so that it could be said: 'God died,' 'God's passion,' 'God's blood,' 'God's death.' For in His nature God cannot die; but now God and man are united in one person, so that the expression 'God's death' is correct, when the man dies who is one thing or one person with God." (Jacobs' ed., pp. 631, 632.)

(Luther's Works. Leipzig Ed. XXI, p. 270.)

O Lord God, in view of this blessed article, so full of comfort, we should always, in true faith, without strife and doubt, be joyful, sing, praise and thank God the Father for this inexpressible mercy, that He permitted His dear Son to become man like unto us, even our brother. But the miserable devil causes such apathy through proud, envious, desperate men, that our love and blessed peace are hindered and destroyed. Let us bring this plaint before God.

(Formula of Concord with Luther, p. 640.)

"Wherever you can say: 'Here is God,' there you must also say: 'Therefore Christ the man is also there.' And if you would show a place where God would be, and not the man, the person would be already divided, because I could then say with truth: 'Here is God who is not man, and who never as yet has become man.' Far be it from me that I should acknowledge or wor-

ship such a God. For it would follow hence that space and place separated the two natures from one another, and divided the person, which, nevertheless, death and all devils could not divide or rend from one another. And there would remain to me a poor sort of Christ [a Christ of how much value, pray?], who would be no more than a divine and human person at the same time in only one place, and in all other places He must be only a mere separate God and divine person without humanity. No, friend, wherever you place God for me, there you must also place with Him for me humanity; they do not allow themselves to be separated or divided from one another. They became one person, which [as the Son of God] does not separate from itself [the assumed humanity]." (Jacobs' ed., pp. 640, 641.)

Therefore we regard it a pernicious error when to Christ, according to His humanity, such majesty is denied. For thereby there is removed from Christians the very great consolation which they have from the presence and dwelling with them of their Head, King and High Priest, who has promised them that not only His mere divinity should be with them, which to us poor sinners is as a consuming fire to dry stubble, but that very man who has spoken with us, who has experienced all troubles in His assumed human nature, who can therefore have with us, as with men and brethren, sympathy, will be with us in all our troubles also according to the nature in which He is our brother and we are flesh of His flesh. (Jacobs' ed., p. 641.)

We admonish all Christians, since in the Holy Scriptures Christ is called a mystery, upon which all heretics dash their heads, not in a presumptuous manner to indulge in subtile inquiries with their reason concerning such mysteries, but with the venerated apostles simply to believe, to close the eyes of their reason, and bring into captivity their understanding to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. 10, 5), and thence console themselves [seek most delightful and sure consolation]; and thus rejoice without ceasing that our flesh and blood are placed so high at the right hand of the majesty and almighty power of God. Thus will we assuredly find constant consolation in every adversity, and remain well guarded from pernicious error. (Jacobs' ed., pp. 642, 643.)

Conclusion.

(Luther's warning against false union; in connection with Gal. 5, 9:
A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.)

This is a warning which St. Paul deems of great importance, as we also should, especially in our time. For those who pretend that the body and blood of Christ are not present in the Lord's Supper censure and speak evil of us, that we are contentious, stubborn and unfriendly, and for the sake of a single article concerning the sacrament interfere with Christian love and destroy the unity of the Church. They think therefore that we should not attach so much importance to this article, upon which not so much depends, and which is connected with a good deal of uncertainty since the apostles did not explain it as much

as would seem necessary, as for its sake to allow both the whole system of Christian doctrine and the common unity of so many Christian congregations to go to pieces.

Therefore we answer to their pretext with St. Paul and say: A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Just as in philosophy, if we err a little in the outset it will at last grow to an incomparably great error, so also in theology a little error destroys and corrupts the whole system of Christian doctrine. Therefore we should well distinguish between doctrine and life. *The doctrine is not ours, it is God's*, who has made us to be only servants and ministers of it. Therefore we neither should nor can yield or give up the smallest tittle or letter thereof. *The life is ours*, therefore the Sacramentarians can ask nothing of us except what we are willing to and ought to do, suffer, forgive, etc., within this limit, however, that nothing be yielded in doctrine and faith. For here we always say with St. Paul: A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Therefore in this matter we cannot yield a hair's breadth. For as to doctrine, it is so exactly circumscribed, its boundaries so well marked, that we can neither add to it nor take from it without great and notable injury. But as regards our life we are at liberty to take more upon ourselves or to yield something, to do and suffer, as necessity may require.

St. James in his epistle aptly and well says: Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. He says this not of himself, but undoubtedly as he heard it from the apostles.

Therefore we must regard doctrine as being like unto a fine, solid, gold ring, in which there is neither flaw nor fissure, for as soon as such a ring has a flaw or fissure it is no more entire.

Therefore in that they esteem this matter so lightly, they show very plainly what estimate they place upon the majesty and glory of the divine Word, etc. If they really and heartily believe that it is God's Word, they would not toy and trifle with it in so trivial a manner, but bestow upon it the highest honor, and believe without doubt and controversy what it says and presents to them, would also know, that one Word of God embraces all, and again that all the Word of God is included in one; would know, that all the articles of our Christian faith are one and again that one embraces all, and that if we let one slip, all the others will, in time, one by one also be lost.

Therefore we let it pass, that they boast of Christian love as much as they can: we on the other hand boast of the majesty and glory of the divine Word and faith. Love may indeed yield, and it involves no harm or danger; but this is not the case with the Word and faith. Love must endure all things and yield to every one, faith on the other hand must and can endure nothing and in short can yield to no one. Love, however willingly it yields, believes all things, excuses, forgives and endures all things, is often deceived: at the same time, however, all these deceptions can do her no injury that could really be called an injury, that is, she does not on that account lose Christ, even though she be deceived. Therefore she

does not permit herself to be perplexed, goes right on, helps and does good to every one, even the unthankful and those who are not worthy of it.

On the other hand, in matters that pertain to our salvation we can, of course, yield nothing in love, can approve of no error, can not call it right. For in this case we would lose not only a benefit shown to an unthankful person, but the Word, faith, Christ Himself and eternal life.

I have expressed this with so many words in order to confirm those who are of our part, and to teach the others, who may possibly be offended by our firmness and think that we are so positive and bold without any good reason. Therefore we are not at all to be led astray by their much boasting of their willingness to preserve love and unity between us and themselves, and how it grieves them that these are to be rent asunder. For if any one does not love and honor God and His Word, no matter what else he may love, it will not help him. Etc.

Hence St. Paul, in this passage, admonishes both teachers and hearers not to think that the doctrine of faith is a matter of so little importance that we can toy with it for pastime as we please. It is the *sunlight* that comes down from heaven and enlightens us, inflames and governs us. But just as the whole world with all its wisdom and power cannot turn the sunlight that comes from heaven to earth from its course, so we can neither take anything from nor add anything to the doctrine of faith, unless indeed we want to pervert it altogether.

Chapter IV.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE ARMINIANS.

MOST intimately connected with the Reformed Church are the Arminians (named after their founder Arminius, d. 1609), who made their appearance in the Dutch Reformed Church about the beginning of the 17th century, in opposition especially to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, but who therewith also fell into the false doctrine of salvation by works and finally into Rationalism.

They teach :

1. In regard to the *Word of God*, that not the whole content of the Holy Scriptures, without distinction, is inspired of God. (Contrary to 2 Tim. 3, 15. 16, where no distinction is made.)

2. In regard to *God*, that the three persons of the Trinity are not of the same rank (as if, since the Son is begotten of the Father from eternity, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, it must necessarily follow that the one person is subordinate to the other).

3. In regard to *Man*, that innate sinfulness is a natural consequence of the fall of Adam, but that without the addition of actual sin it would not be reckoned against us.

4. In regard to the *Work of Christ*, that the suffering of Christ is not vicarious, but only a voluntary offering, which God, of His free love, regards as all-sufficient.

5. In regard to *Justification*, that, properly speaking, an imputation of the merit of Christ is not to be thought of, and that faith *without works* does not justify.

6. In regard to *Grace*, that man is just as capable of accepting as of rejecting the grace of God (whilst, according to the Scripture, the natural man can only resist), and only then, when,* moved by divine grace, he has ceased to make use of this evil power, and suffered himself to be apprehended by the grace of God, is able, with this newly given power, again to accept it. (Phil. 3, 12.)

7. In regard to *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* essentially like Zwingli, regarding the former more particularly as a solemn usage for receiving members into the Christian Church, which reminds us of God's gracious will and obligates us to faithful obedience; and the latter especially as a feast of remembrance in which we make a grateful confession, and whereby our mutual love is strengthened.

Chapter V.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE SOCINIANS.

THE Socinians (especially in Poland and Transylvania), whose chief error affects the doctrine of the Trinity (whence the name *Unitarian* and *Antitrinitarian*) and the person of Christ, are a sect who combined the keen intellectual criticism which scholasticism applied to dogmas, toward the close of the middle ages, with the rationalistic ideas of humanitarianism. It was not so much that they carried Protestantism too far as that they represent a rationalistically changed Catholicism.

They teach, according to Lælius Socinus of Sienna (d. 1562 at Zurich):

1. In regard to the *Word of God*, *a*, that the Old Testament is only of subordinate value to the Christian (against this see Matt. 5, 17); *b*, that the Scriptures are not, throughout, the word of God, but only here and there contain it (against this see Chap. IV, 1, p. 209); *c*, that whatever is contrary to reason can not be regarded as the word of God (forgetting to distinguish between the natural and the divinely enlightened reason).

2. In regard to *God*, that He does not foreknow the free acts of men, and that there is only one person in the Godhead, according to John 17, 3 (where, however, God the Father is called the only true God, as

distinguished from the false gods of the heathen [1 Cor. 8, 6], and not in opposition to the Son; else John would directly contradict himself, since in 1 John 5, 20, he likewise calls the Son "true God.")

3. In regard to *Man*, that the fall of Adam indeed induced death, but no hereditary depravity, much less hereditary guilt.

4. In regard to the *Person of Christ*, that He was only man, but before entering upon His office as teacher He was lifted up into heaven, to be initiated into the mysteries of the divine will, and after His resurrection received divine power and honor as the reward of His willing obedience.

5. In regard to the *Work of Christ*, that His chief merit consists in His perfect doctrine concerning the divine will, and that by His death and resurrection He confirmed and sealed this doctrine; by His sufferings, however, He prepared Himself to assume the duties of His royal-priestly office in heaven, whence as King He can, and as High Priest He will, help all His own in time of need.

6. In regard to *Justification*, that faith in Christ is necessary to justification, but that this faith in Christ is nothing more than a believing obedience to His commands, unto a hope of future immortality.

7. In regard to *Grace*, that it *aids* the free will, externally by threats and promises, internally by illumination and a heavenly foretaste.

8. In regard to *Baptism*, that according to the command of Christ it was instituted only for the first

still sensual Christians from among Jews and heathens, but according to apostolic usage may also be applied to more recent proselytes; and finally, that infant baptism at least does no harm, and may, in Christian love, be tolerated.

9. In regard to the *Lord's Supper*, that it was indeed instituted for all time ("till He come"), but that its only object is, that the death of Christ may be shown forth in a ceremony pertaining to the senses (the only one in the New Testament), *i. e.* be thankfully praised and magnified by the congregation.

10. In regard to the *Church*, that it is the communion of those who have and confess the true doctrine; essentially, then, a school.

11. In regard to the *Last Things*, that the resurrection of the body is to be denied, and that the ungodly together with the devil and his angels will be finally annihilated. This is eternal death.

Remark: 1. The Socinians hold that the wicked will be altogether annihilated at the last day. As unbiblical as this error is, it is still not so subversive of the foundation of truth as the "new light" fancy that all men, even though it might be after long torment in a kind of hell, and the devils also, will in the end be saved. The so-called Restorationists, adherents of the falsely understood doctrine of the renewal or restoration of all things, teach thus, contrary to the plainest¹ declaration of the holy Scriptures; for the renewing or restoration of all things at the end of the world will extend

¹From Matt. 12, 32, it does not follow that all sins except the sin against the Holy Ghost will be forgiven in the world to come; as if, for example, the Queen of England

indeed to the whole irrational creation, which was not willingly, but on account of human sin, made subject to vanity (Rom. 8, 18-23), but to the rational creation with the difference that only those be renewed who shall have been *willing* to be renewed. God cannot compel a fallen *free* being to love; this would be a contradiction in itself. But whoever supposes that all fallen free creatures will let themselves be turned to love, has neither conception nor experience of the satanic depths of sin, not to speak of its being directly opposed to Scripture.

Remark: 2. The Socinians are the spiritual ancestors of the *Rationalists* of our day. The ideas which the latter entertain of the Word of God as the source of Christian knowledge are very much like those of the Socinians, only that they go a little further, being inclined generally to deny everything beyond the scope of human reason, and therefore arrive at worse conclusions than the Socinians, who still teach a real resurrection of Christ from the dead, and a true deification of the Man Christ Jesus. * * * Besides, full of their principle: "If I am to believe anything, I must also be able to understand it," the Rationalists forget: 1. That if there be truth in any religion, it is precisely in its "hidden points and mysteries," since it is quite natural, that if the "infinite, most high and incomprehensible God reveals Himself," such revelation must exceed the poor finite understanding of man. 2. That it is therefore much more com-

should say, "I will tolerate such wickedness neither in England nor in the colonies", it would by no means follow that she would tolerate certain kinds of wickedness in the colonies which she would not tolerate in England. Besides we must regard the above expression, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come" as a very strong form of saying "in all eternity," as it is also said in a very simple form in Mark 3, 29, "he hath never forgiveness." * * * As regards the other passage, Matt. 5, 26, to which the Restorationists refer, see Chap. I., X.

patible with the nature of the matter in question to reverse the proposition, and say: If I would rightly understand anything, I must first heartily believe it.

But since the most of the Rationalists do not wish openly to oppose the Word of God, they have a twofold way of removing from the Bible whatever does not suit their taste; thus, they give the miracles a moral interpretation, *i. e.* for example, where the healing of a leper is spoken of, they take from it only the moral idea that we should suffer ourselves to be healed from the leprosy of our sins. And as to the teachings of our Lord, they say He sometimes adapted them to the superstitions of the Jews (as, for example, in the doctrine concerning the devil). The so-called "Friends of Light" (*Lichtfreunde*), as well as the German Catholics of our day, generally belong to the Rationalistic school. The former, however, have of late lost all prestige.

Finally we must mention here the Protestant Union (since 1863), in which Rationalists of all tendencies, shades of belief, as well as the representatives generally of a Christianity without dogmas and without miracles, have found a home. They are not willing to be bound to the Confessions or the Scriptures, no not even to the historical facts underlying Christianity, but only to the supposed germ of the Gospel, which they pretend to find in a general charity and in the feeling that they are God's children. Everything which will not bear the criticism of reason is thrown overboard, and, with a rationalistic Christianity in which faith and modern unbelief are supposed to be reconciled, they hope to come to the relief of the Evangelical Church and the German people! Meanwhile they hold meetings, and declaim loudly against the folly and intolerance of believers, imagining that thus they display their own tolerance! But their phrases seem to have lost their charm, and we may take for granted that the Protestant Union has seen its best days.

Chapter VI.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE MENNONITES.

THE Mennonites are a party of Anabaptists, purified from many excrescences by Menno Simons (formerly a Catholic priest at Wittmarsum in Friesland, d. 1559). They reject *Infant Baptism*¹ as anti-Christian, and regard themselves as an *assemblage of saints* exclusively, and thus as the

¹That infant baptism, which dates back to the very earliest days of the Christian Church, is right, is evident from the following: The Lord said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God," not indeed as to possession, but as to right; for they are not indeed already in the kingdom of God (since all men are by nature in the kingdom of darkness), but they may enter in. Now since they also, according to the Lord's declaration, have a right to enter into the kingdom of God, and again, according to the Lord's own declaration, the ordinary way of entering into the kingdom of God is by Baptism (John 3, 5), the Christian Church is only carrying out the design and will of the Lord, by bringing children to Him, who is still with her to the end of the world (Matt. 28, 20) in holy Baptism, that He may bless them; for if the *end* is theirs, the *means* must also be. But if you object, that Baptism without faith avails nothing, and that an infant cannot yet believe, remember that faith as to its deepest signification is nothing else than a spiritual susceptibility for God and godly things; then, that such faith is the work of God (Eph. 2, 8); again,

true Church (as if no tares grew in the field of the Church). Connected with this separatistic, self-conceited sanctity, is their principle of abstaining from all military service (as if the holiest men, as king David,

that in little children the work of the Holy Spirit meets with much less resistance than in adults (for adults are to become like little children, so as to offer no resistance, Luke 18, 17, cf. with 16); finally, that John the Baptist, even in his mother's womb, was filled with the Holy Ghost (Luke 1, 15, cf. with 41). But if you inquire how faith can be conceived of in the case of little children who have as yet no consciousness, we answer: God gives faith to the infant in the same embryonic or germ-like form in which He gives to it all natural gifts of the mind. Now what may not all be found hidden in such an infant, and yet it has no consciousness of its riches and can make no use of them. Just as a mother who has given life of her life to the infant and nourishes it, bends over the little one's crib and the infant in the meantime begins to know and to love her, so Another looks down upon the infant upon which in Baptism He has graciously bestowed the forgiveness of sins and in whose heart He has awakened a tendency to spiritual life; and this One likewise remains not a stranger to the infant, it learns to lift up its eyes to Him and to love Him who first loved it.

But if you are surprised at reading nothing in the Acts of the Apostles about infant Baptism, remember first, that mere silence is no evidence against anything; and secondly, that even now yet, every where among the heathens, where a Christian congregation is to be organized, the ministers of the Gospel must first turn their attention to the adults; since, if the parents remain heathens, there is no surety whatever that the children, when they arrive at a suitable age, will receive Christian instruction, that the blessing conferred in Baptism may not be lost again. For the Lord not only commanded "Go and (according to the original) make disciples

had not waged war without being censured therefor²), from civil offices (as if the government did not bear the sword in God's stead, Rom. 13, 1-4), and the legal oath.³

The Mennonites soon separated into two parties, the more strict or *subtle*, and the less strict or *gross*; and the latter again into two parties, the one holding

of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," but also expressly added: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; *i. e.* let Baptism be followed by a thorough Christian education.

²In 1 Chron. 29, 3, no censure is expressed implying that all war, without exception, is an abomination in the sight of God, for David waged his wars "before God," *i. e.* with the knowledge, consent and by the command of the Lord, and thus they were the Lord's battles (1 Sam. 25, 28). But, that God forbade him, as a man of war, to build the temple, is connected with the significance of the temple, since it was to foreshadow the Messiah, the Prince of Peace. It was therefore much more appropriate that Solomon, whose very name suggests the idea of peace, should build it.

³In Matt. 5, 34-37 (cf. with James 5, 15), our Savior, who came not to abolish the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them (by clearly and thoroughly explaining them), did not intend to forbid each and every kind of oath, but only the wanton and uncalled for. This is very evident from Deut. 6, 13, and 10, 20; also Ps. 15, 4, in which passages a proper oath is allowed (cf. also Heb. 6, 16-17). The marginal note (Luther's) to Matt. 5, 34, well says: "All swearing and every oath of man's own doing or taking is here forbidden; but if love (which is the fulfilling of the law!), necessity, our neighbor's welfare, or the honor of God demand it, it is well done."

fast to the Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election, and the other inclining more to the Arminian and Socinian doctrine on this and other points. Of the *subtle* party there remain but few, and the division among the *gross* was ended by the merging of the strict in the less strict party; and of the three prohibitions, from military service, civil office and the oath, the first two have been very generally dropped. The Mennonites, who now, by the way, call themselves Baptists (those favoring Baptism), have congregations in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, France, North America and Southern Russia.



Chapter VII.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE BAPTISTS AND NEOBAPTISTS.

IN regard to Infant Baptism, the Baptists (since 1633) agree with the Mennonites. They branched off from the Puritans¹ and Independents² of England, and have spread widely, especially in America. They too are divided into two principal classes, the one inclined more to Calvinism, the other to Arminianism. The former, adhering to the doctrine of special election to grace in the sense of Calvin (see Reformed Distinctive Doctrines, III), call themselves *Primitive Baptists*; the latter, who in common with the Arminians (Chap. IV) reject this doctrine, call themselves *General (Universal or Freewill) Baptists*. A part of the Primitive Baptists looked upon the work of missions as an interference on the part of man with divine election, and founded an "*Anti-Mission-Baptist Congregation*"; a part of the General Baptists, however, found that the Scriptures command the laying on of hands before the Lord's Supper, and founded a "*Six-principle Baptist*" Congre-

¹Opponents of the Episcopal organization.

²Opponents of the Presbyterian and Synodic organization.

tion (Heb. 6, 1. 2). Other branches of Baptists are: the *Christian Baptists*,³ who reject the doctrine of the Trinity; the "*Reformed Baptists*" ("Disciples of Christ" or Campbellites), who claim for their object a clearer comprehension of Scripture; *Snake-Baptists*, who claim that the non-elect are the seed of the serpent (Gen. 3, 15), and, in view of predestination, regard the training up of children as useless; the *Seventh-Day Baptists*, who observe the seventh day of the week; the *Dunkards* (or Tunkers), who baptize only by immersing in a stream or pond, and that forward, have introduced three new sacraments (washing of feet, the holy kiss, and the anointing of the mortally sick), and, finally, receive the Lord's Supper only at night, and as an aftermeal to a meal proper. We must here name also several Methodistic sects (see further on), viz. the "*Winebrennarians*," named after their founder, a deposed Reformed clergyman, and the "*Kuemmellites*," so named after one of their ministers who taught the necessity of feet-washing before communion.

In opposition to the "extreme worldly" Baptist congregations in North America, there stand at present the German Neobaptists (New Baptists) as a "pure congregation of saints." They first made their appearance in 1834, in Hamburg, and, through the influence of English and American Baptists, soon spread nearly all over Germany, Denmark and Sweden.

³Called also "Christian Connexion," and sometimes "*Christians*." D. M. M.

These people attach less importance to their varying view concerning Baptism, than to the necessity of presenting a visible congregation of saints, since they regard the State Church, lacking as it does a proper church discipline, as Babel. On account of human inability always to distinguish unerringly between wheat and tares, the object aimed at can never be attained on earth; hence the constant separating and gathering in, and the endless divisions among them. The "Evangelical Alliance," which grew on English soil, and whose moving element is the English Baptist, recently made a public appeal for their tolerance in Germany. The "Baptists" themselves cherish the decided hope that the spread of their communion will be attended with great victories. They greet every event which threatens to destroy the "State Churches" as a true star of hope.



Chapter VIII.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE QUAKERS.

THE Quakers are spiritual descendants of the fanatical Schwenkfeld (who lived at the time of the Reformation). Since the middle of the seventeenth century they rallied around the shoemaker, George Fox, in England, and were soon afterwards transplanted to North America (Pennsylvania) by William Penn. Their chief error consists in this, that they place an internal word (called also *inner light*) not only on an equality with, but even above, the external word of Scripture; and this "light" is the Spirit, as if He came along in the air, and were not in the Word, which is Spirit, according to the Lord's testimony. To this mystical contempt for everything external is due the fact that they have no clear, well-defined doctrine, nay, that even the most important doctrines (as, of the Trinity, the person of Christ, Reconciliation, Justification) are mollified in an emotional manner; further, that they not only reject Infant Baptism, like the Mennonites and Baptists, but all baptism, and also the Lord's Supper, as well as (in spite of Eph. 4. 11-13) the properly authorized office of the ministry, inasmuch as they allow every one who is, or thinks he is, moved by the Spirit, to teach in their religious assemblages, women not

excepted, though the Apostle would not allow them to teach openly (1 Cor. 14, 34. 35; 1 Tim. 2, 11).¹

In connection with this mystical contempt for everything external, which of course is usually connected with a separatistic self-conceited sanctity, they further (at least the more strict among them), like the Mennonites, abstain from all military service, from the oath and civil offices; they also avoid the use of all customary titles resting upon a difference in station (calling every one *thou* or *thee*), renounce all fashions, and, in puritanic anxiety, all not purely spiritual enjoyments. However, we must not forget the very decided moral character which distinguishes them, and the noble charity which they display.

¹From 1 Cor. 11, 5, it is indeed evident that women taught publicly in the congregation at Corinth. This, however, was an abuse, to approve which never entered the mind of the Apostle.



Chapter IX.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE SWEDEN- BORGIAN.

THE Swedenborgians are the only sect which has gone forth from the bosom of the Lutheran Church. Their founder was Swedenborg (d. 1772), a Swede. Under the name of "New Church" (as "a new institution of divine goodness and truth"), they have spread also to England, South Germany and North America, hoping that all Christian churches would once merge in them, and form one universal Christian Church.

Swedenborg, whom his followers regarded as a divinely sent messenger, could not content himself with that "access which we have by faith to grace," Rom. 5, 2 (he was in his heart opposed to the Lutheran doctrine of justification), but would live here upon earth already by sight, and to this end establish a palpable intercourse with the higher spirit world.

Swedenborgian errors are:

1. The *Word of God* has a double sense; a natural sense, for the comprehension of man, and a spiritual sense, for that of the angels. (But God spake to men and for men, and thus the hidden sense for the angels would be to no purpose.)

2. In the *Divine Being* there is only one person, who has, however, revealed Himself in a threefold manner (creating, redeeming, sanctifying). * * *
An angel is "a departed, pious human soul," (but

whence the angel spoken of Genesis 3, 24, when no person had died yet?) and the "*devil*" is the sum of "all the souls of departed wicked men." (Thus then there was no devil until at least several persons had died, and yet the devil was a murderer [of men] from the beginning, and helped to bring about the very first death, that of Abel. John 8, 44, compared with 1 John 3, 12.)

3. The idea of *Hereditary Sin* or hereditary guilt from Adam implies a contradiction, offends moral sentiment and has no foundation in Scripture, since Adam and Eve were no real persons; otherwise it is true indeed that sin is transmitted from parents to children, nay, depravity is continually increasing.

4. *Jesus Christ* is Jehovah (God the Father Himself) in a glorified human form.

5. But He became man in order to bring back to their proper bounds those *wicked spirits* who were pressing forward from hell to heaven, in spite of and to the torment of the good spirits; and thus the redemption wrought out by Him is rather an external "deliverance from the power of hellish spirits"; and concerns the lower congregation on earth less than the upper congregation in heaven.

6. When man confides in God, prays to Him, and fulfills his duty to his fellow-men, he is *re'generated*. (Thus then first the fruits, then the tree; first good works, then regeneration.)

7. Of course the *power* for this comes from above. (With them only a form of speech.)

8. *Baptism* is a sign and means by which introduction into the Christian Church takes place, and which is accompanied by divine influence. (Thus seems to be more than a symbol.)

9. But, as *Baptism* introduces into the Church, so the *Lord's Supper*, spiritually, into heaven.

10. *The Church* consists of all those who accept the Lord Jesus Christ as the only God, and avoid and flee evil as sin; which means as much as of all those who have been enlightened through the servant of the Lord, Emanuel Swedenborg.



Chapter X.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE IRVINGITES.

THE Irvingites (so called after their English founder, Irving, d. 1834) deny that the Reformers had any insight into the divine plan of the Church, or a divine commission extending over the Church as a whole—for to this there belongs, according to their view, apostolic power and authority. They regard the extraordinary miraculous gifts of the time of the Apostles—those echoes of the miracle of all miracles, “God manifest in the flesh”—not especially as extraordinary evidences of divine intervention for the first implanting of Christianity in the God-estranged world, but hold rather that it belonged to the divine plan to bestow them undiminished upon the Church for all times. According to their view they were lost through the fault of the Church, which became weary in sighing and praying for the promised reappearance of the Lord, and at the same time suffered the gradation of churchly offices given in Ephesians 4, 11-13 to be dropped. The Irvingites, namely, understand the passage just referred to as implying that the three enumerated offices, thus also the office of Apostle and Prophet, were given to the Church for all time; a construction which the words “till we *all* come in the unity,” etc., by no means call

for, since these words then also have their application, if the extraordinary offices mentioned with the others were to last only until the propagation and preservation of the Church would be possible by means of the ordinary office.

The idea is not far distant, to regain by zealous and incessant prayer what the Church lost through her negligence in praying for the reappearance of the Lord, and this idea they indeed sought to carry out. It was in the year 1830, when, in consequence of their united prayer, as they thought, with all the signs of the Apostles' times, a new Pentecostal miracle rested upon the offices newly established according to the plan of the Apostles.

These offices extend partly to the Church as a whole (Apostle, Evangelist, Shepherd or Teacher); partly to the individual congregations (Angel or Bishop, Presbyter or Priest, Deacon). The Deacon has nothing to do except with external matters; the Presbyter is the pastor proper, the Angel, the overseer of the congregation. The Evangelist brings the good tidings to all the unconverted, and the Shepherd to all the converted, without regard to congregations; but the college of Apostles — one by one they have died; they were all subjects of Great Britain! — govern, from England, the whole Church, which has, to a certain extent, her missionary field in the whole of Christendom outside of England. As the Apostles are elected at the instance of the Prophets, so they again must prove the spirits of the Prophets. The Prophets must comfort, reprove, exhort, explain dark

passages of Scripture, reveal the future, and point out those who are to be ordained by the Apostles for the different offices.

The Irvingites attach so much importance to the word proclaimed in a living form, that they do not hesitate to denounce the Bible Societies as "the curse which walks through the land killing the Spirit through the letter." They attach an almost mechanical effect to the sacraments, and do not wish even children to be kept back from the Lord's Supper, which they love to call a sacrifice of praise and thanks, and not of "atonement." They have, very largely, introduced Roman Catholic elements into their worship (incense, holy water) and also practice anointing (according to James 5, 14). One of their marked peculiarities is the "*sealing*" of believers by anointing with oil and the laying on of hands by the Apostles. They claim that, according to Revelation 7, 3 sq., by this means 12,000 of each of the twelve tribes into which they divide Christianity, are to be preserved from the great tribulations which will precede the near coming of our Lord. This sealing is administered to no one under twenty years of age. They allow women also—who are only forbidden to "speak" in the congregation—to prophesy, for this they think is an activity of the Holy Spirit, and not of man—as well as to speak with tongues (generally a more or less spasmodic utterance of unintelligible words, often only inarticulate sounds).

Irvingism regards the doctrine of the reappearance of Christ as the very essence of all Christian truth, and

thus sets forth also in the most unequivocal manner, the unsoundness of its tendency. It therefore handles the article concerning the Last Things with special predilection, and — contrary to all sound dread of too closely surveying this dim field of prophecy — defines it with the greatest certainty and precision. It teaches concerning this about as follows: When once the wrath of Anti-Christ shall burst forth, the Church of the saints (*i. e.* the “sealed”) shall be caught up and meet the Lord in the air (1 Thess. 4, 17), and with them shall be united the saints who have died in the Lord (first resurrection). Anti-Christ will then drive the Jews to Palestine, where they will repent in the presence of the Lord, who, with the Church which met Him in the air, and the just who arose from the dead, shall return in glory (first return) to judge Anti-Christ (first judgment). Now the Millenium begins. Jerusalem is rebuilt, the temple is again erected, the throne of David restored. — The just of the Old Testament, of the first resurrection, form as it were the aristocracy of this new kingdom; the Apostles on twelve thrones govern the twelve tribes of Israel; but the bride (the congregation of Irvingites) sits with Christ on the throne. Jews go with the Gospel among the heathen to bring in their fullness. Only then, when Satan shall have once more burst forth again with all the power of his deceitful cunning, will follow that which the old Church has taught concerning the Last Things (second advent, second resurrection, second judgment). — In England and America Irvingism seems to have had its day. In Germany its

prospects seem to be better; in Prussia there are said to be about eighty Irvingite congregations.

The Plymouth Brethren, or Darbyites (after the Irishman, John Darby, d. 1882), who likewise consider themselves specially inspired, share with the Irvingites the idea that the Lord will soon reappear, only that they think this event will *immediately* come to pass. On the contrary, in direct opposition to the Irvingites, who look to a proper Church organization for all salvation (although this could not save the Church from declension in its very prime), they reject all and every churchly organization, even the office of shepherd (or pastor), as altogether injurious. A sentimentally sweet rest in the wounds of Christ is the characteristic of their piety—and their fundamental doctrine is, that all those who stay back in Babel will, at the early return of Christ, at best remain on the real earth, whilst they themselves will be caught up, with the Lord, into heaven. In England the Darbyites could gain no firm foothold; the principal field of their operations is Switzerland, and next to that, France.

Chapter XI.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE MORMONS.

THE Irvingites regard the Mormons ("Latter Day Saints") as their satanic antitype. These think that they also in the same year, 1830, were blessed with a new Pentecost, under their prophet Joseph Smith, and boast not only of speaking with tongues, like the Irvingites, but of other miracles, even to the raising of the dead. What the Irvingites still await in the spirit, the Mormons have already in the flesh—a second paradise, at least in the germ; for it shall once extend from the "valley of the Great Salt Lake," which furnished a secure refuge to those of them banished from Ohio, Illinois and Iowa, over the whole earth. The most prominent features of their absurd system, strongly appealing however to the sensual in man, are the following:

1. The new revelation which Joseph Smith translated from newly discovered writings in "Reformed Egyptian" (!) — the "Book of Mormon"—is the original system of Christianity, lost to all other so-called Christian Churches. These revelations, which Smith claims to have found on golden plates,¹ and which he

¹About 8 inches long by 7 wide, and about the thickness of ordinary tin. D. M. M.

was able to read only by means of the "urim and thummim," (two transparent stones set in rims, like spectacles), soon proved to be an almost literal copy of a historical romance written by a quondam clergyman.

2. No one can walk in the way to heaven except by full and unconditional obedience to the revelations of the "seer" (see 4) as well as to the whole hierarchy. This is divided into the "priesthood of Melchisedec", connected in a mysterious manner with God the Father and with Christ, and the "Aaronic priesthood," whose office is to give the people external doctrines and usages.

3. No woman can become a partaker of heavenly glory without her husband; nor can a man attain to the highest perfection in the future world without at least one wife (hence polygamy with churchly sanction, "the sealing"); see however what is said below.

4. At the head of the whole Church there is a "seer," clothed with apostolic, or rather papal, authority;² he receives direct divine revelations, therefore each one owes him unconditional obedience.

Their first "seer," *Smith*, a thoroughly corrupt man, was murdered (1844) in prison at Carthage, Ill.,

²The Mormon catechism claims that at the second baptism of their founder (May 15, 1829) even the Apostles Peter, James and John, who never die, appeared bodily, in order to ordain him as an Apostle by the laying on of hands, and thus to lay a new ground for an unbroken "apostolic succession."

by an enraged mob; he was succeeded by *Brigham Young*, a carpenter (d. 1877), he by *John Taylor* (d. 1887); their present "seer" is *Wilford Woodruff*. — They are actively engaged in missionary work, and their missionary territory is the very largest, since they regard all who are not Mormons without distinction as heathen. The active propaganda which they have carried on has not been without results; in England, Scotland, Denmark, Norway, and also in the northwestern part of Germany they have succeeded in gaining adherents, who, in part at least, have emigrated to Utah. In this territory, where they settled after many wanderings, there were 153,911 Mormons in the year 1889. Since the year 1874 the United States government has taken steps to suppress polygamy, but without much success, as the "sealing" is done in secret. True, quite recently (September, 1890) Woodruff declared: "We do not preach polygamy, we simply tolerate it." This declaration however was dictated only by his dread of a general law being enacted which would deny to all Mormons the right of suffrage. It remains to be seen therefore whether that declaration will have any practical results. — But the fact that such a mixture of mad superstition and coarse sensuality, like Mormonism, could find adherents even in Europe, is an alarming indication of increasing religious demoralization. As for the rest, a system like Mormonism is already judged, bearing within itself the germ of death, although for a while it may seem to succeed. To increase the numbers of their communion they employ

two means, missions and polygamy; if time and circumstances were favorable, they would also employ the third, that is, the true Mohammedan means, to wit, the sword. Young's "avenging angels" committed many deeds of murder. In 1877 the Mormon bishop Lee was hanged, because twenty years before he had led on a band of Mormons and Indians who — not without Young's knowledge — ruthlessly butchered one hundred and twenty emigrant settlers¹ who were on their way through Utah to California! According to their idea the meridian of their Millenium will be reached when the saints in the new Jerusalem at Salt Lake will have united with the Jews in old Jerusalem.

Besides the Mormons, there is another party in America, who think that they are already in the enjoyment of the Millennium, and have been for more than one hundred years. They are the "Shakers," who, to the number of two or three thousand, live unmarried in eighteen colonies. In the year 1758 *Anna Lee*, the ill-mated wife of a blacksmith in Manchester, England, began to preach the doctrine that to prepare properly for the second coming of Christ it is necessary to abstain from all carnal intercourse. Derided in England, she, together with thirty followers, emigrated to America in 1774. Anna died in 1784. Then the veneration of "Mother Ann" properly began; as Christ is the Son of eternal wisdom, so she is

¹Lee was executed on March 22, 1877, by being shot on the very spot where the massacre — known well as the Mountain Meadow massacre — took place. — D. M. M.

her daughter. Celibacy, community in labor and property, and blissful communion with the heavenly spirit-world, fill up the life of the brothers and sisters. The Shaker Ministerium at Mount Lebanon, N. Y., is the head of the Church, whose worship consists in dancing and expressions of joy. Their new revelation seems virtually to have banished the Bible.

The Spiritistic movement, which attracted a good deal of attention, in Germany too a few years ago, also originated in America. Since the Spiritists themselves, in many instances at least, pass off their wisdom for religion, it will not be amiss to give this movement at least brief notice. It was in the year 1843 when a shoemaker's apprentice at Poughkeepsie on the Hudson, claimed to have received spirit communications when in a trance. At the same time (also in New York state) two sisters — children in age — received wonderful communications from spirits by means of rapping on tables, walls, furniture, etc. Soon there appeared hundreds of mediums, who either themselves wrote what the spirits communicated, or caused them to write it. Since the year 1850 the movement found favor and enthusiastic representatives in Europe. It was not long before the spirits were induced to show themselves, at least in part (especially hands and feet). The movement reached its culminating point toward the close of the 70's, when the celebrated medium, *Slade*, succeeded in converting the natural philosopher, Zöllner, to Spiritualism, by all kinds of, many of them truly wonderful, manifestations (moving of tables, falling of pieces of

wood and coal from the ceiling, written communications on the inside of a folding slate securely tied, the appearing of a hand, etc.). But, enthusiasm was short-lived; the veil was lifted, and the credulous victims were undeceived; early in the next decade (1880-90) a number of mediums were shown to be imposters, or their feats were imitated by natural methods. From a religious point of view, the Spiritists of course maintain the immortality of the soul, but are generally far removed from Christianity; without any true consciousness of sin, a kind of self-redemption of man is taught, Christ is a great medium and His resurrection is to be taken in a spiritistic sense. The trivial and stale thoughts which the revelations of spirits have hitherto offered us, are in no way to be compared with the profound teachings of evangelical ethics. And, if the hope was entertained that Spiritism would counteract Materialism, even that was not realized, for the manner in which spirits rap on tables and walls, show their hands and feet, and the like, is in itself *thoroughly materialistic*, and shows that there is a total lack of knowledge as to what the real nature of a spirit is. But if, finally, the question be asked how these wonderful phenomena of Spiritism are to be explained, we point first of all to the fact that many of the spirit revelations have been proven to be jugglery pure and simple. And even though not all of these phenomena could be shown to be tricks, or be explained by natural laws; should it really be shown that there is here some other order of things, of one thing the Christian will always be sure: These are not divine revelations.

The communion with the personal God in which he lives, and the historic revelation, have taught him to know the voice of the good Shepherd, and this he does not find in any of the stale and vapid stuff of these revelations. But even if we grant the reality of the latter, they certainly come from some other spirit world, "the rulers of the darkness of this world, * * * spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. 6, 12).



Chapter XII.

SOCIETY FOR THE GATHERING OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD IN JERUSALEM.

THE followers of Christian Hoffmann of Württemberg, like the Irvingites, have no confidence in the Church as at present constituted, especially since, in 1848, "the true sentiment of the masses became apparent." Hoffmann himself, urged on by the moral corruption of society which had now become known, founded the "Society for the Gathering of the People of God in Jerusalem"; a society for the establishing of a kind of Millennium, endeavoring to show that everything depended on a Christian national life; that the declarations of the prophets point to a people of God, but that this end is to be reached only in Jerusalem. Hence it is necessary to emigrate to Palestine and there establish a holy people of God, who, on the basis of the Old as well as the New Testament, shall present to the world the realization of what is implied in the civil law of the Old Covenant (including the Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee).

Four men therefore organized themselves into a committee for the gathering of the People of God, and a petition was presented to the German Diet, asking them to induce the Sultan to give the congrega-

tions of the "Society for the Gathering," etc., as they might be organized, permission to settle in the Holy Land on favorable terms.

The Diet of course took no notice of this petition. In the year 1855 they appealed to "Christians and Jews" for "support for the People of God in Jerusalem", having proposed to send a commission to the Holy Land, and estimated the cost of the first train of 8,000 to 10,000 families at 5,000,000 florins — \$2,000,000 — (of which 500 florins — \$200 — had been raised up to August 1855).

In the year 1856 a congregation was organized in Kirschenhardthof (consisting, in 1859, of 16 families, with institutions for educating boys and girls, and a school for inner Missions and Missions in the Orient), and in the beginning of the year 1858 Hoffmann, with two companions, left Germany to reconnoitre the Holy Land. In September of the same year those who returned made a very tame report. After this they confined themselves, primarily, to the building up of the "spiritual temple", which had been abandoned soon after the time of the Apostles; this work they were going "to lay hold of anew", and asked for the coöperation of "all Churches, Confessions and Sects." The "peculiar function", however, of the spiritual temple, and "its power for the restoration of the unity of the spirit" consists "in showing people the great conditions of eternity, the great conflict between life and death, between heaven and hell, salvation and condemnation, conditions which extend alike to all men, and the uncovering of which condi-

tions alone will be able to bring men into the one great path of the fear of God." From this "spiritual temple" (1 Cor. 2, 28), so the Hoffmannites, hoped, "the temple in Jerusalem, which prophecy has pointed out as the means for the regeneration of the Occident and Orient, will surely proceed!"

But, as to the arrangements of the spiritual temple, we must first (so they claim) look to this, that the places of worship — after the pattern of the tabernacle, the temple of Solomon, and the temple which Ezekiel saw in a vision — have "an enclosed court and within that a sanctuary," and that the holy acts be performed before the altar with the cross "as the sign of the Son of Man." Baptism is to be "administered by immersion by a regularly called teacher"; the Lord's Supper, "the means of the communion of the body and blood of Christ," can, according to Acts 2, 26, "be administered and received", even in smaller circles, "by members of the congregation who feel their need of it." But, whatever plan be adopted as to organization, "so much is certain, that in order to the spiritual temple the exercise of the functions of Apostles, prophets, teachers, wonder-workers, etc., is prescribed, and even if, for some of these offices the proper persons cannot be found in a congregation, the maintaining of the divine order dare never be set aside. In every congregation gathered for the purposes of the spiritual temple there must necessarily be deacons and elders."

Thus then, in the year 1861, the "*German Temple*" was really founded. A number of men in South Ger-

many (Protestants and Catholics) left the existing churches and founded the new Church (or community), with its own Synods, Priests and Elders, and Hoffmann, as Bishop, at the head. Their longing for the promised land was also to be gratified. In the year 1869 Hoffmann secured several houses in Jaffa. Now emigration began, the total number of emigrants reaching one hundred. Gradually other colonies were established in addition to the one in Jaffa, viz. in Haifa, Sarona, Beyrout, and about 1878 also in Jerusalem. In the mean time the number of colonists had grown to one thousand and several hundred. Since then much has been done for the educational system of the Temple. Hoffmann himself in the mean while, showed more and more clearly the deviation of his views from those of the Church. In the year 1870 already he wrote: "The Temple does not consist of a doctrinal system of dogmas from the Holy Scriptures, but in the carrying out of all that which is written Matt. 5, 17. * * * The confession of the Temple is therefore expressed, not in doctrinal propositions, but in tasks to be done." As though the one should exclude the other; as if clear conceptions should render active doing impossible! Even then already they manifested the greatest indifference to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This gradually increased until they clearly, and regardless of all consequences, attacked the doctrine of the Trinity, of Reconciliation and of the sacraments. Hoffmann's views were spoken of as Judaizing Rationalism, and very properly so. As for the rest, these heterodox views led to a

schism in the Temple, a part of the congregation at Haifa withdrawing under the name "*Reichsbruederbund*" (League of The Brethren of the Kingdom). Hoffmann died in 1885. Within the circles of the Temple the number of those who are returning to the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church is on the increase, so that it is to be expected that the Judaizing extravaganzas of the founder will gradually be relegated to oblivion.

Remark: 1. Dissatisfied with Rationalism, a number of families emigrated from Württemberg to Southern Russia in the beginning of this century. Those among them who settled in the fertile valleys of transcaucasian Grusia soon fell into all kinds of fanaticism. In the year 1842 a prophetess among them commanded emigration to the Holy Land, in order to be ready for the Millennium. Those sent in advance for the purpose of reconnoitering brought back the report that they did not like Palestine at all. So they concluded that after all it was better to stay where they were.

Remark: 2. An exceedingly interesting Jewish-Christian movement originated several years ago in Kischenew in Bessarabia (Southern Russia). The Jewish attorney, *Joseph Rabinowitz*, after planning for a long time as to how to better the external condition and the religious status of the Jews in Russia, called upon his co-religionists to emigrate to Palestine, when the persecution of the Jews in Southern Russia began in 1882. But, on the way to Palestine he changed his mind. The leading thought with him was: Externally and internally Israel can find salvation only by following a safe leader. This man (leader), "known to all the dwellers on the face of the earth, because of the purity of His noble soul and His fervent love to His people" is "our brother," Jesus Christ. His cotemporaries did not understand the purpose of Jesus, "namely to lay stress upon the observance of those legal precepts which relate to the head

and the heart, and not upon those relating to trivial outward acts." The doctrine of Rabinowitz presents the following points: The Old Testament as well as the Scriptures of the New Testament must be the rule and source of doctrine, not however the Talmud, and just as little the post-Apostolic doctrine and forms, which originated in the midst of heathen Christian influences. Thus a communion (congregation) is to be organized which shall retain everything found in the Old Testament which is not directly excluded by the declarations of the New Testament. Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, is the Messiah promised in the Old Testament, who, born by the Spirit of God, lived and taught in the power of the same Spirit, was then crucified, but was raised up of God and exalted to eternal glory. The Trinity, and the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, are rejected by Rabinowitz as unbiblical, and as having their origin in heathen Christian reason. With regard to the Trinity it is declared: "Believers from among the heathen call the three persons Father, Son and Holy Ghost; among us they are called the One God, His Word and His Holy Spirit, who are all *one*." Baptism and the Lord's Supper are recognized as necessary Means of Grace, the latter, however, to be observed as a meal in the true sense of the word, with the addition of ancient Jewish prayers. Circumcision is retained, but is not made obligatory on non-Jews; the Sabbath also, and the old Jewish festivals are retained. — Rabinowitz's efforts look to the founding of a congregation of "New Israel" on this basis. In the year 1885 the synagogue of the "holy Messiah, Jesus Christ" was solemnly dedicated for the small congregation that had been gathered, and soon afterward Rabinowitz was baptized in Berlin. Any further reaching results of the movement have, so far, not appeared. — As for the rest, we cannot avoid serious doubts as to this movement. Even though then, when that shall come to pass which is written Rom. 11, 26 ("and so all Israel shall be saved") many things in the congregational life will assume other forms than those which have grown out of the historic

development of heathen Christianity, still it does not seem to us that the doctrine of the Trinity is one of the unimportant and variable constituents of the system of Evangelical doctrine, nor that its origin is to be looked for in heathen Christian deliberations. See, against this, only the one passage, Matt, 28, 19! And how can we reconcile this studied emphasizing of the distinction between heathen and Jewish Christians with what Paul says, Gal. 3, 28-29, and Eph. 2, 14?



Chapter XIII.

DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES OF THE MORAVIANS.

ALTHOUGH originally gathered from among members of all religious confessions without regard to doctrinal difference, and thus forming the first *united* Church, yet the Moravians stand, as a whole, nearest to the Lutheran Confession, especially since Bishop Spangenberg, in the second half of the 18th century, purified them from many excrescences. His "Short Summary of Christian Doctrine," which professes to stand on the foundation of the Scriptures and the Augsburg Confession, has never indeed been regarded as a confessional writing, which is partly accounted for by the peculiarity of the Moravians, numbered 5 (below). Without directly rejecting the other Confessions, they adopt in a general way the Augsburg Confession; true, in the sense rather of not wishing to dispute the doctrines set forth therein, as they do not generally like disputations. Of an express deviation in doctrine we can therefore not speak; the deviation that does appear belongs rather to individual views, principles and arrangements. Before we proceed to the presentation of this deviation, it must be remarked that the points enumerated below are not at all to be applied indiscriminately to each of the Moravian Brethren, especially at the present time, when there are many among them who have a better and more thorough knowledge of those things.

1. Originally they professed to be a congregation of saints alone.

Remark: The old Easter litany also indicates this: "I believe that our brethren N. N. and our sisters N. N. (here

those persons of the place, who have died since the last preceding Easter, are mentioned by name) have ascended to the upper congregation and entered into the joy of their Lord."

2. They incline to the belief that they stand in a much closer relation to the Lord than any other Church communion; hence no doubt especially the use of the lot, which is to indicate, in an immediate manner, the will of the Lord.

Remark: It is true there are examples of the use of the lot in the Old Testament, but 1, only in extraordinary cases; and 2, without express divine command or promise; so that where God gave His blessing thereto, it must be ascribed to His gracious condescension. But if in the Old Testament, there was neither command nor promise for it, much less is this the case in the New Testament,¹ since God has now set

¹As regards Acts 1, 26, to which they refer for the use of the lot, observe:

1. Casting the lot took place at the boundary line of the Old Testament time, and before the Holy Ghost had yet been poured out. 2. They who cast the lot were Apostles. 3. They were about choosing an Apostle, for which two things were necessary; the one, that the future Apostle should have been a constant eye and ear witness of the works and teachings of the Lord (John 15, 27); the other, that he should be directly chosen by the Lord (Gal. 1, 1). As to the first they themselves took thought (v. 21-22); the other they left to the Lord (v. 24). * * * Besides, it may still be questioned, whether the Lord, who afterwards directly called Paul to the Apostleship, really confirmed the choice of Matthias. But so much is certain, the election of an Apostle can never again occur: the missionaries of our day are not Apostles, but Evangelists (Eph. 4, 11). Therefore all authority which might be derived from this passage for the use of the lot falls to the ground.

aside the "divers manners" of revelation (Heb. 1, 1), and in these last days has spoken by His Son for all times, and also poured out His Holy Spirit on all flesh.

3. They incline to regard God the Son as worthy not only of equal (John 5, 23) but of even greater honor than God the Father. (The following expression of Spangenberg is very characteristic in this respect: "The very highest which we know to say of God the Father is, that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.")

4. They see in Christ Himself altogether too much the *Brother*, the *Savior*, the *High Priest*; and altogether too little the Lord, the Judge, the King.

5. They attach due importance to only one point of doctrine, viz. *Jesus Christ and His bloody merit*, and do not rightly know how to use anything else in the Scriptures, unless it be immediately connected with this; whilst nevertheless *all* Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. 3, 16).

Remark: The passage 1 Cor. 2, 2, cannot be cited in justification of this; for when Paul says: "I know (and preach) nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," this does not exclude God the Father and the Holy Ghost, nay rather includes them; for Jesus Christ as to His divine nature is one with both, and the whole doctrine of justification through Jesus Christ cannot be thought of without the other two persons, of whom the one justifies and the other sanctifies. Hence, in the adduced passage, Paul gives prominence to Jesus Christ for no other reason than that He is the only Mediator between God and man, and when he adds, "and

Him crucified," he again sets forth Jesus Christ's reconciling sufferings and death as the chief thing, without, however, covering up what He did and taught besides this. In short, Paul would by no means say: I know and preach nothing concerning the other two persons of the Godhead, and concerning Jesus Christ no more than His death on the cross; but he would say this: Not my poor self, but Jesus Christ the crucified (the whole Christ, however!); this is the point whence all my preaching emanates, and whither it returns; for the whole Scripture of the Old and New Testament testifies of Christ crucified. (Luke 24, 25-27; John 5, 39.)

'Tis indeed true: the doctrine of Jesus Christ and His bloody merit is the center of Evangelical doctrine, and whoever has taken this rightly to heart, may be content therewith. Yet it is, and will continue to be, dangerous, to be content with one point of doctrine, even though it be the very center; for we are expressly admonished in many passages of Scripture to grow also in knowledge, and not always to use the milk of the divine Word, *i. e.* the elementary doctrines (Heb. 5, 13), but to press forward to perfection in knowledge and to an understanding of the perfect harmony of the Scriptures; and that, too, as is evident from Heb. 6, 4, to the end that we may not retard in, or fall away, altogether from our Christianity by reason of an imperfect knowledge of the Scripture; for no one can deny that the less deeply any one is indoctrinated in the harmony of the Scriptures, the more easily he will be driven about and away by "divers and strange doctrines" and make shipwreck of his faith. For each single doctrine of the Scriptures is only then fully explained and established when viewed in the light of the whole; and there is no better defense against doubts concerning any one part, than the contemplation of the wonderful harmony of the whole.

6. They make Christianity to be preëminently a matter of "*feeling*;" this is proved, above all, by their many affecting hymns, by many parts of their cultus.

which border on the emotional, as well as by not a few of their sermons, which aim more at refreshing the mind by grace, than at enlightening the understanding, or admonishing the heart (*i. e.* in the sense of the Scripture, the will) to repentance and sanctification.²

Remark: The Gospel should not be directed first of all to the sensibilities — for thus it is apt to cause only a pious state of intoxication which soon passes away — but it must be directed to the understanding, which is darkened through the blindness of the heart (Eph. 4, 18), in order to enlighten it; through the enlightened understanding to the chief offender; the blind perverted heart or will, in order to convert it; but from the converted heart peace and joy flow into the conscience, which imparts joy not only to the mind, but even to the “joints and marrow.” So then the true way to Christian feeling is through the understanding over and above the will. Besides instructiveness is the first requisite of a good sermon (1 Tim. 3, 2), and exhortation to repentance and sanctification, connected with doctrine, the second. The apostolic epistles are also arranged in this way.

7. As a natural consequence of the preceding it follows that, beside the preaching of grace they cannot find any suitable place for the preaching of the law

²The requisites which Zinzendorf lays down for a good sermon are characteristic in this respect:

To a homily for a congregational assembly there belong:

1. That a holy awe should pervade the assembly.
2. That the speaker himself should grow “warm on the subject.”
3. That the warmth which he feels be at the same time sweated out, as it were.

If this is not the case, it is better to have *Anagnotas* (readers) than to speak instructively and in a dry way.

(which is, even for the regenerated, a mirror of sin and a rule of virtue).³

8. In comparison with the pure doctrine they attach too much importance to cultus and organization, in general to "good order", through which they wish "to prevent evil", and from which "nothing should induce us to depart."

Remark: 1. The first expression, that "good order is to prevent evil," ascribes to it too much efficacy, since it can at best now and then prevent the breaking forth of evil. The other expression, that "nothing should induce us to depart therefrom," can be applied only to doctrine, which is not ours but God's, whilst all usages, even the most salutary, are ours, and may, under certain circumstances, for the sake of love, be changed.

Remark: 2. Since the Synod of 1857 the Moravians have taken a step in advance in their system of government, not only by the addition of four members to the "Conference of Elders" at Berthelsdorf, but also by granting certain provincial rights to the larger groups (the German, the American and the English province) of the several countries.— In the year 1884 the Moravians numbered not more than 31,715 members, belonging to 147 congregations.

³ In place of the greater or less want of the preaching of the law, they have a kind of external (in many respects monastic) law of discipline, which can of course not supply the want; for the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, whilst external discipline alone is lame and makes lame.

Chapter XIV.

DISTINGUISHING PECULIARITIES OF THE METHODISTS.

STRICTLY speaking Methodism¹ is the form of Pietism peculiar to England. Just as Pietism counterbalanced the constantly growing benumbing influence of dead orthodoxy in Germany, so did Methodism in England. John Wesley (born 1703) and George Whitefield (born 1714) are the fathers of Methodism. A most mighty movement was set on foot by these two men. Their activity was untiring, their influence great. In an almost irresistible manner they sought to win the hearts of people, in the churches when the opportunity was given them, or, if these were closed against them, in the open air. In the most glowing colors they could picture, for the hearts of their hearers, all the terrors of hell and the judgment, thus moving them to instant conversion. True, at first the populace showed decided, often rude, opposition; but still the cause of Methodism moved on victoriously. Among the wretched and the outcast,

¹"Methodist," like the German "Pietist" is a name used in derision by opponents. Any one who adopted a new or peculiar tendency in faith or life was called a "Methodist," and later the word came to mean a methodistic Pietist, *i. e.* a dissembler (Frömmeler).

especially, numberless awakenings took place. They were often accompanied by writhings and convulsions. But they were followed, as a rule, by an earnest, strictly moral life. The opposition of ecclesiastical and temporal authority to Wesley, proved vain; his success grew apace. He could say: "The rescuing of souls is my calling", and "the whole world is my parish." The number of his hearers was generally from 20,000 to 30,000, but sometimes from 60,000 to 80,000 listened to his calls to repentance in the open air. He had an especial talent for hunting up the neglected, the poor and the distressed. He was one of the first who knew how to carry on the work of "inner Missions."

His relation to the State Church grew more and more untenable. The Methodists had a large number of lay teachers and lay helpers, who had no churchly call whatever to their office. The establishing of independent Church organizations therefore became a necessity. That we cannot here give the history of the conflicts that grew out of questions pertaining to Church organization and government, is a matter of course. Whitefield, who divided his time between England and America, planted the cause of Methodism in the latter country; here, as there, the cause soon flourished and grew. Wesley died in 1791. The effect of his labor is seen in the fact that in the year 1790 there were already, in England, America and the West Indies, 120,000 adherents of Methodism.

In the United States of America the Methodist Church has had an especially rich and grand development. Here it has had an independent organiza-

tion, since the year 1784, as the "Methodist Episcopal Church." The peculiar nature of Methodism is more clearly defined in America than in Europe. It knows perfectly well how to bring about those revivals of religion which are a peculiarity of the religious life of America, and, by means of the so-called "new measures", has done much for the perfecting of the Methodist plan of securing conversions. As connected with this, camp-meetings, often prolonged for weeks, deserve especial mention. Tents, cottages and a speaker's stand are provided, and then preaching is kept up almost incessantly. Every means is brought to bear; the object is to arouse and excite the hearer by inspiring singing, by heaven-storming prayers and by sermons depicting all the terrors of hell. Finally conflicts and convulsions of repentance appear, sobbing and sighing are heard. Those affected in this manner are directed to the anxious bench, where the preachers, kneeling beside them, pray for and talk to them, until the fear of repentance is dispelled by the sense of grace — or, as it is termed, they "get through" — which generally manifests itself in a very loud and boisterous manner, by laughter and shouts of joy, followed by embracing the converts and pronouncing them blessed.

In America, as well as in England, divisions have occurred in the ranks of the Methodists. Even in Wesley's time already such a division took place, since he opposed and his co-laborer Whitefield declared in favor of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. Besides, questions pertaining to organization gave rise

to many divisions which we cannot here specially note. We mention only the "Primitive Methodists" (since 1810), also called Ranters, who separated from the mother Church because she would not permit them to hold camp-meetings, as they were held in America. In the course of time, however, their differences have largely disappeared.¹

Two Methodistic sects of America deserve especial mention here, inasmuch as they have latterly carried on a tolerably successful propaganda in Germany. The *Albright Brethren* (they call themselves the Evangelical Association), so called after their founder, Jacob Albright, who left the Lutheran Church and went over to the Methodists, agree with the latter in doctrine. They are indifferent as to infant baptism. Parents may have their children baptized or not, as they choose. The *Otterbeinians* — or United Brethren in Christ — are so called after the Reformed minister Otterbein

¹*Note by the translator:* A "Southern Afternoon Press" dispatch, sent out from Washington, October 8, 1891, during the session of the Methodist Ecumenical Conference, gives the following, touching divisions in that Church, in America: "The nearest approach to a split between the different branches of Methodism on doctrinal grounds was in 1860, when the Free Methodist Church was organized. This organization was effected at Pekin, N. Y., by a number of ministers who had been expelled from the Genessee Conference of the M. E. Church because they had insisted more strongly than wisely upon the doctrine of entire sanctification. No person who belongs to a secret society, or uses tobacco, or wears jewelry or other fashionable ornaments, is permitted to become a member of this Church, which has a membership of 22,861."

(d. 1813) who went over to the Methodists. In doctrine, as well as in churchly usages, like the Albright Brethren, they are essentially one with the Episcopal Methodists; and, like the former, reject infant baptism.

In Germany too, as already intimated, the Methodists have thrown out their nets during the last decades, and the results they have to show are not inconsiderable. Besides the two sects last named, the Methodist Episcopal Church also sends missionaries — mostly Germans — to Germany. In central Germany, and especially in south Germany, the preaching of the Methodists is well received, particularly so by the lower class of people; so also in Saxony, Württemberg, Bavaria and Baden; also in Westphalia, Thuringia, Hesse, Pomerania and elsewhere.—The Pearsall Smith movement, in its day, also attracted a great deal of attention. Pearsall Smith, namely, a converted factory owner of Philadelphia, traveled through Germany in the year 1875, having in the previous year, at a large meeting at Oxford, called into existence the so-called “Oxford movement.” In truly Methodist style he laid great stress on instantaneous sanctification. Not the forgiveness of sins, but the removal and annihilation of sin through Christ dwelling in us, he claimed to be the one thing needful. Even though his exceeding enthusiasm proclaimed him a new reformer, yet the whole movement has left no marked traces. In his later addresses Smith showed plainly that, notwithstanding his high-flown words about sanctification, he was still a poor mortal, subject to error and to sin.

But, the chief object of this little book is, to characterize doctrine. We shall therefore now proceed to the doctrine of the Methodists. It was not by mere accident, however, that we wrote the caption of this Chapter somewhat differently from former captions. Methodism attaches but little importance to doctrine, and has never made any vigorous effort to formulate its doctrinal views. As a rule it smooths over and extenuates Churchly doctrines, as *e. g.* the doctrine of Original Sin, and the Means of Grace are placed in the background. These points, however, will not show the peculiarity of Methodism; this will become apparent only then when we note their manner of dealing with conversion and sanctification. We sum this up in the following paragraphs:

1. The Evangelical Christian knows that awakening and conversion are wrought through the Word, *i. e.* by God Himself, who, in and through this Word, touches and moves the heart by His almighty Spirit. The Word is therefore to be proclaimed in such a way that the hearer will really hearken to it; if this be the case, then God will begin His work in the soul. It is otherwise with the Methodist. He talks of an immediate, visible, perceptible awakening. This they (the Methodists) seek to produce by descriptions, adapted to the senses, of the torments of hell, by boisterous and exciting music, by prayers causing bone and marrow to quake, all of which have a tendency — and this is the object — to destroy self-possession and becloud self-consciousness. When one has been excited and wrought up by these means, so that his sins

cause him almost physical pain, and the terrors of hell fill him with horror — then is the time to bring him to a confession of his sins. This having been done, the extreme terror of the poor sinner is relieved by loud, exultant exclamations, and glowing descriptions of the blessedness of grace. Here too everything is done with a view to arousing the feelings. When the feeling of blessedness is reached the man is converted. It is expected of him that he be able to give the precise day and hour of his conversion.¹ Thus then, conversion is not the restoration of new life to the *will*, hitherto dead in sins, but the awakening of an *emotional* frame of mind. Therefore the Methodist uses not only the means of spiritual *conviction*, viz. the Word, but all the means of external *persuasion*. The citadel is taken, not by a well ordered siege, but by surprise (Ueber-rumpelung). But, can the new possessor maintain his position? To drop the figure, will this method of conversion really lead to an enduring life-communion with God?

2. When any one has become a child of God, the question very naturally is, how he can *remain* such. The doctrine of our Church gives this answer: By personal communion with that God who daily forgives abundantly all our sins. But God offers us such communion with Himself through the Word and sacraments. It is otherwise with the Methodist. Con-

¹John Wesley, *e. g.* knew of a certainty that he was converted on the 24th of May, 1738, in the evening at fifteen minutes before 9 o'clock.

version, with them, as we have seen, was really an excitement of the feelings. Now, how is the Christianity (religion) of this emotionally wrought-up person to be maintained; for is it not to be expected that a sad sobering down will follow the intoxication of enthusiasm? Most assuredly! Therefore provision must be made for constantly new emotional excitement; the iron must be struck while it is hot, *i. e.* the moment of religious excitement must be used to persuade the convert to observe the laws of morality, and to secure from him a pledge to this end. This is the *legal trait* of Methodism. What grand results it has attained in this way, especially among the lower class of people, is well known. But, are those the true fruits which are attached to the tree from without, or should we not rather work for this, that the good tree "bring forth good fruits" from within itself? Besides, can the heart really, by such an emotional, legal process, arrive at a personal communion with God, of which it is said:

"Now I have found the firm foundation,
Where evermore my anchor grounds" — ?

3. Connected with this there is a third consideration. The Evangelical Christian remains a sinner, nay he becomes more and more such day by day. For, in communion with God, his eye becomes clear, so that with pain and sorrow he sees not only the great beams, but also the little motes, the slightest traces of sin, in his own heart. Thus his dearest treasure, the forgiveness of sins, becomes daily more precious

and more necessary. This full coming to God in Christ, in order daily to receive grace for grace — this is the chief part of his *perfection*. Just as the Apostle, though counting himself among the perfect, in the same passage where he tells this, writes: "I count not myself to have apprehended" (Phil. 3, 12-16). This is the Evangelical conception of perfection. But the Methodist often talks of a different kind, a moral perfection, in man, when he does only that which is good, and the desire to sin is swallowed up in grace. And even though it be granted that sin constantly cleaves to man, it is still misleading and dangerous to hold up before him the goal of such unattainable perfection.

4. From these points the differences of doctrine already indicated are quite apparent, viz. a weakening of sin and a setting aside of the Means of Grace and the Church. For, with the view of conversion and perfection that we have seen, it will be readily understood that they do not take so serious a view of sin as those do who hold the Churchly doctrine, and that there is not the same need of the regular Churchly administration of the Means of Grace.

Thus then the differences between us Evangelical (Lutherans) and the Methodists are not of merely secondary importance, allowing us to rejoice in the active work they are doing even in our own congregations. They are indeed of a very serious nature. One need but think of the restless activity and propaganda-loving spirit of Methodism, of its false view of conversion and sanctification, in order to see this. Methodism represents a sickly Christianity. But, at the

same time we cannot expect to counteract (or overcome) it by that type of Christianity of which, alas, we have too many exponents in our day; a Christianity which is only half-seasoned and has such a horror of the Confessions; but only by the fervid proclamation of the old Gospel, and of the old doctrine of our Church, nothing being suppressed or changed.

Recently a religious party has come to light, which, by strictly following up the purposes of Methodism to the very utmost, presents indeed a caricature of the spirit of Methodism, but at the same time sharply defines its dangers. It is the *Salvation Army*. Let us notice it briefly.

The Salvation Army owes its existence to *William Booth* and his wife *Catharine Booth* (d. 1890). William Booth was born in Nottingham in 1829. At the age of 24 he became a preacher in the Methodist connection, but withdrew from this office in 1861. Both he and his wife, from this time on, had only one object in view, viz. to lead the poor, the outcast and the fallen to repentance. But they thought this demanded a new method. This was "aggressive Christianity." Every means for attracting the attention of people was regarded by them as lawful. Since the year 1865 Booth has been laboring in London. Pitching his tent in some prominent place, he sought to attract the attention of passers-by by earnest addresses in popular language. He succeeded, and the undertaking soon assumed large dimensions. Results were apparent. Thieves, drunkards, abandoned girls, were led to repentance. All connection with Churchly or-

ganizations was studiously avoided, and gradually this became a recognized principle. Booth, a more than usually talented organizer, understood well how to use the new converts as fellow-laborers, and by a firm organization to accustom them to strict obedience. Thus something of a military character gradually found its way into the organization, and this was developed more and more. The duties and positions of the fellow workers were designated by the titles: General, Colonel, Captain, Lieutenant, Sergeant, soldier, etc. In the whole Methodistic plan of conversion military expressions were used, and military arrangements imitated. Thus, for instance, they talk about the war against the world, of volleys of prayer, infantry attacks, or attacks with bombs and grenades, that this is the way a city is bombarded and taken; again, they speak of the wounded and slain being hunted up, after the meetings; in true military style, with loud music, they enter a town or city, the officers also occasionally mounted, etc. At the head of all is the General. He has unlimited authority, and every one is bound to obey his commands. The other leaders of the organization, the officers, are governed by his directions. To them (the corps of officers) there belong men, women, and even young girls ("hallelujah lassies"), for this is especially emphasized among them, that women also have the right to speak in the assemblies. And to this circumstance the Salvation Army owes much of its success. The officers are recognized by some distinguishing mark on their clothing, but every member wears the S. (Salvation Army) — generally on the col-

lar. The Salvation Army has its own, blood-red banner, on which there is, embroidered in gold, the serpent on the cross, over this two crossed swords, and the circumscription: "Blood and Fire." It is made the duty of each new member to labor with all his might for the cause of the Army; parents of new-born children present them in the congregation and a pledge is then and there exacted of them to dedicate them to the Salvation Army; marriages are solemnized by the officers, and the newly-married couple are required to promise to live in the service of the Army. This pledge, of course, rests most heavily on the officers (who, by the way, are not allowed to marry, or to engage themselves, without the permission of the General); they are under close scrutiny and are urged on to devote all their powers to the cause of the Army. The regulations which Booth has given out for this purpose contain indeed a great deal of the wisdom of the serpent and knowledge of the world, but so much the less of the harmlessness of doves. It is the gloomy spirit of Jesuitical, utilitarian morality.

If we turn aside now from the contemplation of the military feature of the Army, we meet, on all sides, nothing but Methodism distorted to madness. Here men and women, dressed in uniform, march along, carrying the red flag, singing boisterously, often halting to exhort the by-standers to repentance; true, they are often insulted by the populace, yet they win many a one for their cause. Or, they assemble in their place of meeting. Hymns are sung to enlivening airs, the story of their conversion is told by the newly con-

verted, or (as they are called) the "trophies"—and "good jokes" are not thought out of place here — then there follow prayers piercing through bone and marrow, full of the fire of fanatical passion. And so it goes on until there are evidences of emotion among the hearers. Then the officers make haste to persuade those who show signs of emotion to come to the anxious bench. Here there is sighing and moaning, until at last the spirit of grace comes; then follow volleys of hallelujahs. The new convert is at once instructed in his duties to the Salvation Army, and told that henceforth he must abstain from spirituous liquors, from tobacco and from fashionable clothing. He is, of course, invited to attend the meetings regularly, but the officers also visit him at home as often as possible, in order to guard against his falling away.

In all this, Methodism is easily seen. The Salvation Army lays little stress on doctrine. True, Booth declared himself in favor of the "old-fashioned Gospel" and its saving truths, but practically this amounts to very little. And, that we do not judge them too severely is evident from the fact that they regard Baptism and the Lord's Supper as mere ceremonies with which we may dispense altogether. This too is Methodism carried to the extreme. Of the same type is the requirement to abstain from things external, and in themselves indifferent, as smoking, for instance, as well as their view of the moral perfection of members of the Army. They claim "there is here, as a rule, a perfect victory over every sinful inclination, passion or habit which formerly was the cause of sin, and generally a complete deliverance from the inclination even."

We cannot trace further the history of individual members of the Salvation Army, or of the spread of the Army itself.¹ Only so much we remark, that their most important periodical, the "War Cry", has 400,000 subscribers, and that in 1884 already Gen. Booth could boast that he had collected 393,000 pounds sterling (about \$1,925,000) for Army purposes. The Army has undertaken campaigns (for conquest) not only in England, but also in North America, Australia, France, British India and Switzerland. Judging by their failures in Germanic Switzerland, it is not to be presumed that they will have much success in Germany. Although recently the newspapers do give accounts of some achievements on their part in Germany, especially in Berlin. At this time the Army is said to have one thousand soldiers in Berlin, and one hundred officers in all Germany.

Nothing further is needed to enable us to form a judgment as to the Salvation Army. Or, dare we pronounce in their favor in view of their *successes* among the abandoned masses? Then, say we, remember the words of our Lord: "By their *fruits* ye shall know them." Their *fruits*, not their *successes*, are to determine our judgment; for successes are gained and come from without, while fruits grow and come from within; therefore only these, and not successes, can show us the inner life.

¹Those specially interested in this matter are referred to the exhaustive treatise of *Th. Kolde*, *The Salvation Army* (Erlangen, 1885).

Third Part.



A Brief Summary of the Principal Unsound
Religious Tendencies in Christianity.



General Observations.

A LONG way lies behind us, dear reader. We have come through many a city with towering walls and floating banners, by many a fortress enclosed and isolated on some height. But nowhere did we feel at home except in our own city, the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Therefore we exultingly say: "We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks" (Isa. 26, 1) and "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God" (Ps. 87, 3)!

But, should any of our readers, having become convinced that the doctrine of our Church is the truly Scriptural doctrine, be tempted to say: "God, I thank Thee, that I am not as other men are" (Luke 18, 11)? Should any one be tempted to speak thus with the Pharisee, he would simply show thereby that he has neither laid hold of nor felt the spirit of the Gospel. The purpose of the pure Gospel is not to satiate, but to make us hungry for more grace. It does not propose to furnish us colored glasses through which to see ourselves in a rosy light, but to clear our vision, that we may see still more and more plainly our own sin and infirmity. It does not propose to magnify us in our own eyes, but to make us small, penitent and humble. Away, then, with all vain-

glory, thou who wouldst belong to the Church of the Scriptural Confession! Honor and glory belong, not to thee, but to Christ alone!

If the individual may not boast, as though by reason of having the pure doctrine he were better than others, neither must the Church of the Scriptural Confession close her eyes to the many defects and infirmities that still cling to her. Woe to us, if we, in our conflict with other Confessions, learn from the world to fall into impenitent boasting. Alas, our Church, in her entirety, must often say of herself now, what the prophet said of the Church of his time: "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment" (Isa. 1, 5. 6). But such a condition will necessarily be attended by fever; and where there is fever there are all kinds of imaginings. And, besides these imaginings of perverted views, how much sleeping and dreaming, how much lukewarmness and imperfection in our midst! No, there is only one thing of which we can and will boast, and that is the grace of God. The streams of salvation still flow in our midst, to give strength and joyfulness to faint hearts; the walls of salvation still encompass our city, so that we are never without protection and defense against the darts that wound the conscience, against the snares that entangle our feet. That the Lord is in our midst, truly, in this let us rejoice! Be this our glorying and our joy! "He that glorieth, let

him glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. 1, 31)! and "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not" (Lam. 3, 22)!

But, if this be so, then certainly we ourselves must not lose courage and grow indifferent, but work on bravely, each one in his place, to advance the interests of our Church. The Lord is with her; it is His work in which we are engaged:

"And as the cause and glory, Lord,
Are Thine, not ours, do Thou afford
Us help and strength and constancy,
And keep us ever true to Thee."

In the second place, we will labor earnestly in our own behalf, so that we may not be satisfied with holding the dogmas which we formerly learned, but that we may experience their power in our hearts, and be intent on searching them still more closely. There would not be so much unbelief in our day, if ignorance in spiritual matters were not so alarmingly great, even among the educated. See then that you be at home in the doctrines of your Church, that you may be prepared to defend your spiritual mother when she is attacked by her own children, whether in trivial mockery, in malicious hatred, or in the blazoned impudence of ignorance!

In the third place, in this nervous, over-excited time, let us have patience with all those who are earnestly and honestly striving after the truth, but are still not able to tear themselves away from imaginings and dreams; they are sick, it is true, but are longing

for health; and this already is a sign of improvement.

But in order that each one may prove himself, whether and how far his life is a healthy life in Christ, and may learn to know his own ailment, the principal unsound tendencies which at present prevail in our Church are here enumerated and briefly characterized. In doing this we can, of course, pay no attention to those who no longer care anything for the Church.

1. **The Lukewarm and Undecided Tendency.**

One believes everything, because the Church teaches it; also attends Church regularly. If there be a fine, impressive sermon, the heart feels thrills of repentance, and the resolution is formed: Now I will begin a new life; and a beginning is really made. Such a one takes part also in all kinds of meetings for Churchly and benevolent purposes, reads the Bible and devotional books, and does not forget to have family worship and to say grace before and after meat. And still, *the heart* is only half engaged in these matters. You are a stranger to the earnest pangs of repentance, you have no true, heartfelt joy in grace, you give nothing for Christ's sake, your prayer is often only the discharge of a duty, without love, without joyfulness! What is the consequence? If earnest times come in your life, if want and anxiety overwhelm you, if you are called upon to make a decision affecting your life, if you are to pass judgment upon other men — then you are not guided by the rule which God's word and your faith give you, but by paltry, cunning calculation, by purely worldly

considerations. You are only half a Christian. Do not wonder if the Gospel bring you only transient, half-way consolation. But do not forget either what God's word says of your manner of life: "Because thou art *lukewarm*, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth" (Rev. 3, 16).

2. *The Catholicizing Tendency.*

One speaks of the Christian confessional writings almost as if they were inspired and of equal authority with the Word of God; the ordination of ministers rather than their vocation is regarded of the greatest importance; indeed they look upon it as a half-way sacrament, and their view of the ministerial office, which they delight in surrounding with a kind of priestly halo, is an exaggerated one.¹ They overestimate the *Sacraments* at the expense of the Word, and lay stress on liturgical *forms* at the expense

¹Buddeus, an old teacher of our Church, expresses himself thus with regard to *ordination*: Ordination presupposes *vocation*, so that the minister of the Word does not really, through the ordination, receive the power to do anything, but the object is this, that united prayer be offered in his behalf for divine grace for the proper discharge of the duties of the office committed to him. The effect of ordination is therefore to be judged by the *character* (essence) of prayer as well as of him who is ordained. There is, however, a certain declaration connected with this usage, that he who has been called is received among the number of those who minister in spiritual things. But the reception itself takes place through the vocation rather than through the ordination.

of the sermon; too much importance is attached to external Churchly unity; they look to *Churchly organization* for their chief results and in this respect turn their eyes somewhat longingly to the English Church with its *episcopacy*, which gives this Church indeed a certain external position, not in itself, however, but in its dependence on the State (which, by the way, is still very conservative). Often too there is a desire for *worldly esteem* and power, and one would not be displeased if people could be compelled to attend service by police regulations.² There is no lack of inclination to regard the historically developed privilege of the supreme episcopacy pertaining to the crown, as a *divine* right, but at the same time this view is entertained, that the inner life of the Church would be rejuvenated if she were more independent of the State.

² Luther, on the contrary, speaks thus of such external compulsory regulations: "Inasmuch as I cannot pour faith into the heart, I neither can nor should urge or compel any one, for God alone does this and brings it about that He dwells in the heart. Thus the compulsory command becomes a mere sham, an external affair, foolery and human tradition; the result is, pretended saints, hypocrites or dissemblers. For there is no heart there, no faith, no love. First of all we must win people's hearts. This takes place when I sow the seed of the Word, preach the Gospel, tell the people their errors. He who would obey then, would obey; he who would not, would stay out. * * * Summary: I will preach it, will tell it to the people, will write it, but as to compelling any one, or urging him by force, that I will not do, for faith wants to be induced willingly, without constraint."

3. The Tendency of Dead Orthodoxy.

The greatest importance is attached to the pure doctrine; without regard to *sanctification* in one's self or others. This spirit prevails in the training of the youth and pervades the sermons. Doctrines, only doctrines are imparted, in their minutest ramifications. But since in such faith the chief part, viz. heartfelt confidence, is wanting, and it is nothing more than knowledge and assent, a matter of the *memory* and the *intellect*, they continue to stand, if I may say so, on their position, not only with their feet, but also move no other member in order to *bend* from their position *down* to others to draw them up to their own with the arms of love. Such coldness of the heart may, if opportunity offers, become *fanaticism*, and is often accompanied by hard-hearted, haughty judgments as to the convictions of others.

4. The Pietistic Tendency.

A one-sided stress is laid on a pure life, forgetful of the fact that this is dependent on the pure Word, just as the fruit on the tree; and thus, in their striving after sanctification, the value of the fountain of sanctification is lost sight of, and the holding fast to the confession of the pure doctrine is, without having examined it, declared to be dead orthodoxy; and the inner power of the divine word itself is held in such slight esteem, that they think that a minister who does not adorn the pure doctrine with a holy life can accom-

plish nothing¹ (evidently contrary to Phil 1, 18 where Paul rejoices in the activity, even though it be insincere, of such dead orthodoxy). Among those affected by this tendency the Christ "*in us*" overshadows the Christ "*for us*"; in addition to the seal of the Word and sacrament they demand the seal of their emotions. Justification by grace is placed in the background; by their works they want to gain the assurance that they are God's children; hence a human, busy running hither and thither in matters pertaining to the kingdom of God. And they will not let the daily duties of our *calling* pass for such matters. Special works, such as the support of Missions, ministering to the wants of the poor and the sick, are especially prized by them in this line. True, these works are in themselves good; they are a duty. But we should not forget that first of all we are to promote the kingdom of God in our own calling. It may happen that one's own children and members of one's own household suffer want and are uncared for, whilst one is thinking of the wants of others and knitting stockings for heathen children. Connected with this external activity there is also an exaggerated view of

¹ So much is true, if the preacher of the Word does not adorn and commend it by a holy walk and conversation, its efficacy will be hindered; so also if he does not properly distribute it, sowing the divine seed too thick or too thin, in bad order, out of season, etc. But the inner *power* of the Word remains the same, and the *efficacy* of this indwelling power is only *weakened* to a greater or less degree, but never destroyed.

the hurtfulness or usefulness of external things for godliness (1 Tim. 4, 8), especially of so-called "things indifferent"; all not purely spiritual enjoyments must be characterized as sinful, and the first spiritual advice given any one will be: "Abstain from this or from that." In this way they sew pieces of new cloth onto an old garment, which however will not last; *i. e.* they begin conversion from without, in one single thing, and never accomplish anything thorough or well-founded, for only the Word of God, which is cast into the heart as the living seed of regeneration (1 Pet. 1, 23), can make the old "garment" of the natural man thoroughly new. But since there is no joyfulness in mere externals, the self-torturing mind is, as a rule, gloomy, and neither heart, eye nor mouth can feel, look or speak joyfully. They are not far from the separatistic spirit of the Conventicle, which is a feature of all self-righteousness. They are inclined to regard all who do not take part with them as children of the world, but themselves, of course, as children of God; in brief, they regard their communion with believers as evidence of their communion with the Lord.

5. The Moravianizing Tendency.

Although closely related to Pietism, and often united with it, in certain respects it presents the direct opposite of the pietistic tendency. Whilst that (the pietistic) insists especially on repentance, this urges more particularly to faith; that speaks especially of God's holiness, this of His love; that looks especially, and with loathing, upon one's own sinfulness, this

with delight on God's grace. Both, however, resemble each other in this, that they, to a greater or less extent, disregard intellect and memory, only that the former is more given to the exciting of the will, the latter to the exciting of the feeling; there they want bitter tears of repentance, here sweet tears of grace.—For every step or decision, even where reasonable reflection would suffice quite well, they would like to have a special indication of Providence, and to this end are ready to regard even the most trivial circumstances as such indications; are ready to find in their own inner disposition, in the presence or absence of a certain joyfulness, the deciding voice of the Lord, without stopping to reflect that perverted human nature delights in its own ways, but finds little delight in God's ways.

Finally, they do not know how to distinguish properly between *awakening* and *conversion*; they are easily satisfied with a confession that testifies of a longing, be it ever so slight, after the Lord Jesus, avoid an open, manly confessional conflict, but love to speak of their own personal, gracious experiences, whilst the pietistically inclined prefers to speak rather of his sinful condition.

6. The Methodistic Tendency.

This tendency is in a certain respect the culminating point of the pietistic, with this difference: the one inclined to Pietism seeks retirement for his own edification, whilst the one inclined to Methodism is not averse to publicity, that he may convert others.

Both insist on repentance (Busze); but the Methodistically inclined would see the pain of repentance grow into a penitential conflict or even a condition of penitential suffering. Thus at least this tendency appears, in its most striking form, in North America and England (see above). Still another error is closely connected with this. The question: "How old art thou?" when asked by persons trained after the manner of Methodists, means: How long since you were converted? for one should be able to give, to the minute, the time of his conversion. Both errors rest upon a third, on this namely, that the Holy Ghost always comes with a rushing sound, and not, as He does, frequently in a still, gentle, almost imperceptible whisper. Hence Methodistically inclined preachers mostly try, by a powerful excitement of the feelings, at once to *force* the will to a resolve, while calm instruction and persuasion take a secondary place; they want to take the hearts of men, for God, by storm, and therefore picture hell as hot as possible, *i. e.* they present to their hearers the most vivid pictures possible of the torments of the damned, helping along all they can by tone and gestures.

This is the Methodistic manner of conversion. But since conversions of this kind generally consist in nothing more than *nervous excitement*, provision must be made in some other way for the reaction which will soon appear.—As for the rest, according to the very sharply outlined Methodistic conceptions, there is such a well-defined difference between a converted Christian and one not converted, that they can readily

write down each individual either into the book of life, or the book of death; thus namely, no one, who has not yet passed through such a penitential struggle, has passed from death unto life. That the making of proselytes is inseparable from such a system, is a matter of course.

7. *The Mystic Tendency.*

Just as they, in general, have no regard for anything external, so they have none for the Word (of God), which, in their view, is also a mere external, but are of the opinion that God must reveal Himself to men in some other way before the revelation in the Word can really profit them any; and that this revelation (in the Word) becomes practically useless after the Holy Spirit has once been poured out into the heart. The first spiritual advice, therefore, which they give, is: "You must pray", without having first directed to and guided them into the Word, since prayer itself consists in nothing else but pleading God's own Word before Him (Ps. 27, 8), clinging to Him by means of it, and not letting Him go except He bless us. Connected with this contempt for the Word and in general of everything external, there is also a disregard for the office of the ministry and of every external calling. They attach supreme importance to the *inner motion* (impulse) of the *Spirit*, which however must first prove its divine origin in this, that external circumstances and relations, which also stand in the Lord's hand, work together with it, or at least finally submit.—Failing to recognize the great depth of human depravity, they think a Christian must always

be so full of the Holy Ghost as to be always ready to preach, and that he needs no other preparation for this than prayer; that, in view of this, the preacher may not only, by the power of prayer dismiss all mental care as to what he is to speak (Matt. 10, 19), but also all systematic arrangement of it, for all study in spiritual matters is, after all, rather a hindrance than a help.—As for the rest, it is self-evident that for the mystically inclined there is no true significance in confessional differences, nay they readily take offense at the name *Evangelical Lutheran*,¹ and prefer to speak of a *universal and invisible Church*. They also love to

¹ 1 Cor. 1, 12. 13, cannot be cited in favor of this; for the word "*Lutheran*" is added only on account of the *material* distinction; otherwise we would be quite content with the name "*Evangelical*." Paul, Cephas and Apollos, however, *differed* in their doctrine not as to matter; the appellations "*of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas*" originated only in a party spirit which looked to the person rather than the matter. In reference to this Luther says:

"If you regard Luther's doctrine as evangelical and the pope's as unevangelical, you must not be so ready to reject Luther, else you reject his doctrine with him, which, however, you regard as Christ's doctrine; but you must say thus: It matters not to me whether Luther be a knave or a saint, his doctrine is not his but Christ's. For you see that the tyrants are not trying to destroy Luther but the doctrine, and on account of the doctrine they attack you and ask you whether you are a Lutheran. Here you must not speak empty words, but confess Christ freely, whether Luther, Claus or George have preached Him. Do not regard the person, but confess the doctrine." (Luther's Works, Erlangen, XXVIII., 316.)

boast of a very intimate communion with the Lord and to bask in the exceeding abundant feeling of His nearness.

Remark: These various tendencies, where they appear decidedly and separately, also manifest themselves, in part at least, by certain external characteristics. The first is fashioned after the world, the second unyielding, the third abrupt (coarse), the fourth full of pretense, the fifth enervating, the sixth stormy and the seventh self-satisfied and reserved.

BESIDES, this is of course true, that if any one belongs for instance to the pietistic tendency, we must not take for granted that, on that account, he is affected by all the errors cited under that head; and again, that it is possible to belong to several unsound tendencies at the same time. By far the most widely spread unsound tendencies of the present time are the Lukewarm-worldly, the Pietistic and the Methodist. At the same time there is no lack of those who lean toward dead orthodoxy and Catholicism.

So then let us each rebuke the other about this matter, that we may be sound in the faith (Tit. 1, 13), and take to heart the admonition: "When for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. * * * But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil" (Heb. 5, 12 and 14).

